

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 485

S. 500

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 500.....	1
Digest of Public Law 485.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 500

January 1, 1955	Senator Anderson(et al) introduced S. 500. Referred to Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
February 2, 1955	Rep. Aspinall introduced H. R. 3383. Referred to House Committee in Interior and Insular Affairs.
March 23, 1955	Senator Watkins discussed S. 500 on the floor of the Senate.
March 24, 1955	Senate subcommittee voted to report S. 500.
March 29, 1955	Senate Committee ordered S. 500 reported with amendments.
March 30, 1955	Senate Committee reported S. 500 with amendments. Senate Report 128.
April 14, 1955	Senate made S. 500 the unfinished business.
April 18, 1955	Senate began debate on S. 500.
April 19, 1955	Senate continued debate on S. 500.
April 20, 1955	Senate passed S. 500 with amendments.
April 21, 1955	S. 500 referred to House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
July 11, 1955	House Committee reported with amendments H. R. 3383. House Report 1087.
July 21, 1955	House Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3383. House Resolution 311, House Report 1332.
February 8, 1956	House Committee adopted a substitute amendment to H. R. 3383, to be reported not later than February 14, 1956.
February 14, 1956	House Committee submitted a supplemental report. House Report 1087, part 2. Remarks of Rep. Fernandez.
February 28, 1956	House began debate on H. R. 3383.
February 29, 1956	House continued debate on H. R. 3383.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 500 (Continued)

March 1, 1956 House passed S. 500 with language of H. R. 3383 substituted. H. R. 3383 laid on table.

March 2, 1956 Senate appointed conferees on S. 500.

March 7, 1956 House appointed conferees on S. 500.

March 27, 1956 House received conference report on S. 500. House Report 1950.

March 28, 1956 Both Houses agreed to conference report.

April 11, 1956 Approved: Public Law 485 - 84th Congress.

House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3383, H. R. 3384 and H. R. 4488 on March 9 and 10, April 18, 20, and 22, 1955 - Part I; and on March 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 28, 1955 - Part II.

Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on February 28, March 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1955.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 485

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT. Authorizes the Interior Department to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project. Provides that, for 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by the act may be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. Authorizes appropriation of \$760 million to carry out this Act.

S. 500

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 18, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development
4 of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin,
5 the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority
6 to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce
7 among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to
8 make all needful rules and regulations respecting property
9 belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among

1 others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, stor-
2 ing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible
3 for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently
4 with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the
5 apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado
6 River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
7 pact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid
8 and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the
9 improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydro-
10 electric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes,
11 hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to con-
12 struct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of
13 the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, res-
14 ervoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant
15 works: Cross Mountain, Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming
16 Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Navajo: *Provided*, That the
17 Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will
18 impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand
19 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater
20 capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located
21 at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean
22 sea level and that construction thereof shall not be under-
23 taken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineer-
24 ing and economic investigations, reexamined the economic
25 justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate

1 documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has
2 certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his
3 judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs;
4 and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following
5 additional reclamation projects (including power-generating
6 and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter re-
7 ferred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial
8 phase) ; Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La
9 Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a
10 dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its con-
11 fluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and
12 other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee,
13 Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navajo: *Provided*,
14 That (a) construction of the participating projects set forth
15 in this clause (2) shall not be undertaken until the Secre-
16 tary has reexamined the economic justification of such project
17 and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form
18 of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress,
19 through the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of
20 such project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reim-
21 bursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this Act
22 can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each
23 such project shall include, among other things, (i) a re-
24 appraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of
25 the project made by the Secretary after consultation with

1 the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the non-
2 direct benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the
3 total cost of construction of each participating project or
4 separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures au-
5 thorized by section 7 of this Act, to power, irrigation, mu-
6 nicipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any
7 other purpose authorized under reclamation law. Section
8 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall, except as
9 hereinafter provided for the San Juan-Chama and the
10 Navajo participating projects, not be applicable to such sup-
11 plemental reports; and, (b) that no appropriation for or
12 construction of the San Juan-Chama project or the Navajo
13 participating project shall be made or begun until coordi-
14 nated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the af-
15 fected States, including (but without limiting the generality
16 of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the Act
17 of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been
18 approved and authorized by the Congress: *Provided fur-*
19 *ther,* That with reference to the San Juan-Chama project,
20 it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir
21 on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the
22 control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan
23 River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed,
24 or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam,
25 and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by

1 the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior
2 in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as admin-
3 istered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

4 SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive develop-
5 ment as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the
6 Upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River
7 system the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colo-
8 rado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to
9 each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
10 pact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to author-
11 ize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further
12 units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional
13 phases of participating projects authorized in this Act, and
14 of new participating projects as additional information be-
15 comes available and additional needs are indicated. It is
16 hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to author-
17 ize as participating projects only projects (including units or
18 phases thereof) —

19 (1) for the use, in one or more of the States desig-
20 nated in article III of the Upper Colorado River Basin
21 Compact, of waters of the Upper Colorado River system
22 the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those
23 States by that article; and

24 (2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine
25 their probable engineering and economic justification and

1 feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be
2 the policy of the Congress that the costs of any partici-
3 pating project authorized in the future shall be amortized
4 from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with
5 the provisions of this Act and Federal reclamation law.

6 SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in
7 constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the
8 Colorado River storage project and the participating projects
9 listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be gov-
10 erned by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17,
11 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supple-
12 mentary thereto) : *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment
13 contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise
14 provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for
15 repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect
16 to any project contract unit over a period of not more than
17 fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized
18 by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution
19 facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organ-
20 ization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation
21 Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capac-
22 ity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property
23 located within its boundaries to assist in making repay-
24 ments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands
25 to be served are owned by the United States; (c) con-

1 tracts relating to municipal water supply may be made
2 without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of sec-
3 tion 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and
4 (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any
5 participating project, payment of construction costs within
6 the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the
7 Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and partici-
8 pating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the
9 use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the
10 Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin
11 fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colo-
12 rado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms
13 of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series
14 994).

15 SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund
16 in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the
17 Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to
18 as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until ex-
19 pended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of
20 this Act other than section 7.

21 (b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying
22 out the provisions of this Act, other than section 7, shall be
23 credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general
24 fund of the Treasury.

25 (c) All revenues collected in connection with the opera-

tion of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made within fifty years after completion of that portion of the project which has not been constructed as of the date of this Act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277) : *Provided*, That revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to

1 power pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a period
2 not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of
3 such unit, participating project, or separable feature
4 thereof;

5 (2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or
6 any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
7 municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this
8 Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the
9 date of completion of such unit, participating project, or
10 separable feature thereof;

11 (3) interest on the unamortized balance of the in-
12 vestment (including interest during construction) in the
13 power and municipal water supply features of each unit,
14 participating project, or any separable feature thereof,
15 at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury
16 as provided in subsection (e), and interest due shall be a
17 first charge; and

18 (4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or
19 any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
20 irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this Act within a
21 period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any de-
22 velopment period authorized by law, from the date of
23 completion of such unit, participating project, or sepa-
24 rable feature thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia

1 project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent
2 with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

3 (e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the
4 storage project and each participating project shall be deter-
5 mined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the
6 first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit
7 or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by cal-
8 culating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily
9 closing market bid quotations during the month of June
10 next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made,
11 on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of
12 the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more
13 years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such
14 average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per
15 centum.

16 (f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Con-
17 gress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

18 SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating
19 project or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allo-
20 cate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized
21 by section 7 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or
22 feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood
23 control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under
24 reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and
25 maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes

1 shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. On
2 January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the
3 Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal
4 year 1955, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost
5 of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado
6 River storage project and the participating projects. The
7 Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the
8 Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irriga-
9 tion, and to other purposes, the progress of return and re-
10 payment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by
11 year, in accomplishing full repayment.

12 SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this
13 Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secre-
14 tary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal
15 powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the
16 greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be
17 sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the
18 authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the
19 operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact,
20 the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or the Boulder
21 Canyon Project Act.

22 SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colo-
23 rado River storage project and of the participating projects,
24 the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan,
25 construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational

1 facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the develop-
2 ment of said project or of said participating projects, to
3 conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic
4 objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for
5 public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas
6 created by these projects by such means as are consistent
7 with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facili-
8 ties to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the
9 propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is author-
10 ized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from
11 entry or other disposition under the public land laws neces-
12 sary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the
13 facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal,
14 State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer,
15 exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as
16 will best promote their development and operation in the
17 public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section
18 shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

19 SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed
20 to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in
21 conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project
22 Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjust-
23 ment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the
24 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande

1 Compact of 1938, or the Treaty With the United Mexican
2 States (Treaty Series 994).

3 SEC. 9. Expenditures for the Cross Mountain, Flaming
4 Gorge, Glen Canyon, Navajo and Echo Park initial units
5 of the Colorado River storage project may be made without
6 regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements
7 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

8 SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
9 such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of
10 this Act.

11 SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States
12 are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver,
13 Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally owned water
14 system, such interests in lands and water rights used or ac-
15 quired by the United States solely for the generation of
16 power and other property of the United States as shall be
17 required in connection with the development or use of its
18 Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such
19 interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by
20 Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so
21 limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than
22 water rights for the necessary functions of the United States
23 Government.

24 SEC. 12. In the operation and maintenance of all facil-

ities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. No right to impound or use water for the generation of power or energy, created or established by the building, operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by this Act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries for domestic or agricultural purposes within any of the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

The terms “Colorado River Basin”, “Colorado River Compact”, “Colorado River System”, “Lee Ferry”, “States

1 of the Upper Division”, “Upper Basin”, and “domestic use”
2 shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the
3 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

4 The term “States of the Upper Colorado River Basin”
5 shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico,
6 Utah, and Wyoming;

7 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin” shall have
8 the same meaning as the term “Upper Basin”;

9 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin Compact”
10 shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11,
11 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona,
12 Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented
13 to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act
14 of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31) ;

15 The term “Rio Grande Compact” shall mean that cer-
16 tain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners
17 representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas
18 and consented to by the Congress of the United States of
19 America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785) ; and

20 The term “treaty with the United Mexican States” shall
21 mean that certain treaty between the United States of Amer-
22 ica and the United Mexican States signed at Washington,
23 District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the
24 utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other
25 rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT,
Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER,
Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. WATKINS,
and Mr. O'MAHONEY

JANUARY 18, 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

1 November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the
2 Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting
3 to ratification thereof.

H. R. 3383

AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 18, 1906

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 18, 1906.
RECEIVED

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, and maintain the Columbia River survey, and to provide for the survey, construction, and maintenance of the same.

1. That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to
2. That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to
3. That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to
4. That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to

A BILL

to amend the act to provide for the
construction of the canal
from the mouth of the
river to the city of
New Orleans, and for
other purposes.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3383

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 2, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development
4 of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin,
5 the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority
6 to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce
7 among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make
8 all needful rules and regulations respecting property belong-
9 ing to the United States, and for the purposes, among others,
10 of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water

1 for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the
2 States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the
3 provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportion-
4 ments made to and among them in the Colorado River Com-
5 pact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respec-
6 tively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid
7 land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of
8 navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as
9 an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the
10 Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and
11 maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River
12 storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants,
13 transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti,
14 Echo Park, Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon: *Provided,*
15 That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height
16 which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty
17 thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such
18 greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline
19 located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet
20 above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not
21 be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of fur-
22 ther engineering and economic investigations, reexamined
23 the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied
24 by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental
25 report, has certified to the Congress and to the President

1 that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its
2 costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the fol-
3 lowing additional reclamation projects (including power-
4 generating and transmission facilities related thereto), here-
5 inafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah
6 (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La
7 Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam
8 and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with
9 the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary
10 works); Pine River extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, Smith Fork,
11 San Juan-Chama, Navajo: *Provided*, That (a) no appro-
12 priation for or construction of the San Juan-Chama project
13 or the Navajo participating project shall be made or begun
14 until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted
15 to the affected States, including (but without limiting the
16 generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant
17 to the Act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall
18 have been approved and authorized by the Congress: *Pro-*
19 *vided further*, That with reference to the San Juan-Chama
20 project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and
21 reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used
22 solely for the control and regulation of water imported
23 from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be
24 established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on
25 the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all

1 times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the De-
2 partment of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio
3 Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Com-
4 pact Commission.

5 SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive develop-
6 ment as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the
7 Upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado
8 River System the use of which is apportioned to the Upper
9 Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and
10 to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin
11 Compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to
12 authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of
13 further units of the Colorado River storage project, of addi-
14 tional phases of participating projects authorized in this
15 Act, and of new participating projects as additional informa-
16 tion becomes available and additional needs are indicated.
17 It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to
18 authorize as participating projects only projects (including
19 units or phases thereof) —

20 (1) for the use, in one or more of the States desig-
21 nated in article III of the Upper Colorado River Basin
22 Compact, of waters of the Upper Colorado River system
23 the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those
24 States by that article; and

25 (2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine

1 their probable engineering and economic justification
2 and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared
3 to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any
4 participating project authorized in the future shall be
5 amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent con-
6 sistent with the provisions of this Act and Federal
7 reclamation law.

8 SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in
9 constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the
10 Colorado River storage project and the participating projects
11 listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed
12 by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902,
13 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary
14 thereto) : *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts
15 shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided
16 for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of
17 the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project
18 contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years
19 exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b)
20 prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities,
21 repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as
22 defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act
23 of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy
24 assessments upon all taxable real property located within its
25 boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a

1 substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by
2 the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water
3 supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the
4 last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act
5 of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served
6 by any participating project, payment of construction costs
7 within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to
8 the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and
9 participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments
10 of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins
11 of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper
12 Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper
13 Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms
14 of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series
15 994).

16 SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate
17 fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as
18 the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred
19 to as the "Basin Fund"), which shall remain available until
20 expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions
21 of this Act other than section 7.

22 (b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carry-
23 ing out the provisions of this Act, other than section 7,
24 shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the
25 general fund of the Treasury.

1 (c) All revenues collected in connection with the oper-
2 ation of the Colorado River storage project and participating
3 projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be
4 available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying
5 the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of,
6 and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado
7 River storage project and participating projects, within such
8 separate limitations as may be included in annual appro-
9 priation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d)
10 of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction
11 costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability
12 of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in
13 the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment
14 to be made within fifty years after completion of that por-
15 tion of the project which has not been constructed as of
16 the date of this Act, and (4) payment in connection with
17 the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in
18 the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277) : *Provided*, That
19 revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available
20 for appropriation for construction of the units and partici-
21 pating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

22 (d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating
23 needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the
24 Treasury to return—

25 (1) the costs of each unit, participating project,

1 or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
2 power pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a
3 period of years not exceeding the expected economic
4 life of such unit or participating project but not to ex-
5 ceed one hundred years;

6 (2) the costs of each unit, participating project,
7 or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
8 municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this Act,
9 within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date
10 of completion of such unit, participating project, or
11 separable feature thereof;

12 (3) interest on the unamortized balance of the in-
13 vestment (including interest during construction) in the
14 power and municipal water supply features of each
15 unit, participating project, or any separable feature
16 thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the
17 Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest
18 due shall be a first charge; and

19 (4) the costs of each unit, participating project,
20 or any separable feature thereof which are allocated
21 to irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this Act in equal
22 annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty
23 years, in addition to any development period authorized
24 by law, from the date of completion of such unit, par-
25 ticipating project, or separable feature thereof, or, in the

cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

(e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 7 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water

1 supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes
2 authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construc-
3 tion, operation and maintenance costs to authorized non-
4 reimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the
5 provisions of this Act. On January 1 of each year the
6 Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous
7 fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, upon the
8 status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing,
9 operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage proj-
10 ect and the participating projects. The Secretary's report
11 shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment
12 allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other
13 purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon,
14 and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accom-
15 plishing full repayment.

16 SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by
17 this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by
18 the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other
19 Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce
20 the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that
21 can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exer-
22 cise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere
23 with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River
24 Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the
25 Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project

1 Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into
2 under said Acts without the consent of the other contracting
3 parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for
4 the generation of power and energy at the plants of the
5 Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the
6 appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant
7 to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States
8 of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

9 SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the
10 Colorado River storage project and of the participating
11 projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investi-
12 gate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public
13 recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the
14 development of said project or of said participating projects,
15 to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic
16 objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for
17 public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water
18 areas created by these projects by such means as are con-
19 sistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2)
20 facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the
21 propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized
22 to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry
23 or other disposition under the public land laws necessary
24 for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the
25 facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal,

1 State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer,
2 exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions
3 as will best promote their development and operation in
4 the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this
5 section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

6 SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed
7 to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be
8 in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project
9 Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjust-
10 ment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact,
11 the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande
12 Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican
13 States (Treaty Series 994).

14 SEC. 9. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen
15 Canyon, Curecanti, and Echo Park initial units of the Colo-
16 rado River storage project may be made without regard
17 to the soil survey and land classification requirements of
18 the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

19 SEC. 10. Construction of the projects herein authorized
20 shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary
21 requirements and the economic needs of the country.

22 SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
23 ated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise
24 appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out
25 the purpose of this Act but not to exceed \$1,055,000,000.

1 SEC. 12. In planning the additional development neces-
2 sary to the full consumptive use in the Upper Basin of the
3 waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the Upper
4 Basin and in planning the use of and in using credits
5 from net power revenues available for the purpose of
6 assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects
7 herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado,
8 New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall
9 have regard for the achievement within each of such
10 States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the
11 waters of the Upper Colorado River system consistent with
12 the apportionment thereof among such States.

13 SEC. 13. In the operation and maintenance of all facili-
14 ties, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction
15 and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin
16 of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed
17 to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado
18 River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder
19 Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the
20 United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water
21 from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event
22 of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply,
23 any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an
24 action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce

1 the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the
2 joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

3 SEC. 14. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to
4 institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and
5 to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon
6 the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all trans-
7 mountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system
8 and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the
9 Colorado River Basin.

10 SEC. 15. As used in this Act—

11 The terms “Colorado River Basin”, “Colorado River
12 Compact”, “Colorado River system”, “Lee Ferry”, “States
13 of the Upper Division”, “Upper Basin”, and “domestic use”
14 shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the
15 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

16 The term “States of the Upper Colorado River Basin”
17 shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico,
18 Utah, and Wyoming;

19 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin” shall have
20 the same meaning as the term “Upper Basin”;

21 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin Compact” shall
22 mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948,
23 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colo-
24 rado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to

1 by the Congress of the United States of America by Act
2 of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31) ;

3 The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that cer-
4 tain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners
5 representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas
6 and consented to by the Congress of the United States of
7 America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785) ;

8 The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall
9 mean that certain treaty between the United States of
10 America and the United Mexican States signed at Wash-
11 ington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating
12 to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and
13 other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol
14 dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited
15 in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and
16 consenting to ratification thereof; and

17 The term "economic life," as used herein in relation
18 to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the
19 period during which the unit or project is expected to con-
20 tinue to provide the power and energy contemplated from
21 the design and construction of the power facilities of the
22 unit or project, due regard being given to historical ex-
23 perience with similar types of works, allowances included
24 in "replacement costs" for replacing major items of equip-
25 ment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the
26 useful life.

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASPINALL

FEBRUARY 2, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

H. R. 3363

A BILL

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 24, 1955
For actions of March 23, 1955
84th-1st, No. 52

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments..1,9,10	Housing, farm.....33	Reclamation..8,15,17,22,29
Appropriations.....38	Information.....16	Research.....20,27
Committee assignments...13	Labor, farm.....30	Rice.....10
Commodity exchange.....31	Legislative program....9	Rubber.....3,11
Cotton.....1,9	Loans.....12	Sugar.....21
Dairy products.....4,32	Marketing.....2	Surplus commodities..23,37
Economic report.....26	Military training.....7	Tobacco.....9
Education.....16	Newsprint.....20	Trade agreements.....6
Electrification...14,17,24	Organization, executive.12	T.V.A.....14
Farm credit.....34	Personnel..5,7,9,18,35,39	Water research.....27
Farm program.....28	Prices.....36	Water utilization.....22
Food supply.....37	Price supports.....25	Wheat.....2,23
Forestry.....19		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to increase rice allotments. Senate debated cotton-allotment increase bill. Senate committee reported bill to exempt feed wheat producers from marketing quotas. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to include onions under CEA.

SENATE

1. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Continued debate on H. R. 3952, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 regarding cotton allotments, after the bill had been temporarily put aside for action on legislation respecting sale of rubber-producing facilities. The Stennis amendment (see Digest 51), on which a record vote has been ordered, was pending at recess for consideration today, Mar. 24. (pp. 2927-8, 2987-88.) The Agriculture and Forestry Committee agreed to an amendment to be offered as a committee amendment to this bill, which would strike the provision which provides further additional acreage equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of each State's share of the national acreage allotment apportioned prior to enactment of this bill, and would further provide that in drought areas or in other disaster areas, a farmer may transfer his allotment from one farm to another. The amendment would further provide that no State allotment would be less than 3,500 acres. (p. D237.)
2. WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 46, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm (S. Rept. 119) (p. 2929).

March 23, 1955

-2-

3. RUBBER. Rejected S. Res. 76, disapproving the sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission; and S. Res. 78 and 79, disapproving the sale of three synthetic-rubber-producing plants in Calif. (pp. 2935-74, 2977-85).
4. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Sen. Aiken expressed the hope that the Rules and Administration Committee will reconsider its decision not to permit milk to be sold through vending machines in the Senate Office Building and the Capitol, and stated that the Republican Policy Committee has unanimously voted in favor of installing milk-vending machines in these buildings (p. 2980).
5. PERSONNEL. Sen. Byrd submitted amendments intended to be proposed to S. 67, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government (p. 2933).
6. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Payne submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (p. 2933).
7. MILITARY TRAINING. Sen. Wiley inserted a letter from the department commander of the Wis. American Legion supporting S. 2, to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, etc. (p. 2935).
8. RECLAMATION. Sen. Watkins commended the support of CIO of S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project, and inserted a recent CIO news release and statements by wildlife and conservation experts on this subject (pp. 2974-7).
3. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM for today, Mar. 24, as stated in the "Daily Digest": Continue consideration of cotton acreage allotment bill, to be followed by bills to increase pay of Federal employees (p. D237). Majority Leader Johnson also announced that "we also plan to consider at the earliest possible date on which we can sandwich them in" bills relating to tobacco allotments (p. 2983).

HOUSE

10. RICE ALLOTMENTS. Passed as reported H. R. 4647, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to increase by 5% the 1955 rice acreage allotments for each State receiving a rice allotment; allocate, in those States where State allotments are allocated to the counties, the additional allotment on the same basis as the previously determined 1955 allotments, except that there would be no adjustment for trends in county allotments; and provide allotment of 500 acres to S. C. and Okla., to be used to the extent needed for new rice growers in those States who have prepared for production in 1955 (p. 3037).
11. RUBBER. Rejected, 137 to 276, H. Res. 171, to disapprove the proposed sale to the Shell Oil Co. of certain Government-owned synthetic rubber producing facilities as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (pp. 2993-3005).

Drew Pearson wrote that everyone was so busy trying to beat the \$10 tax cut as far as he knew only one Senator was working against it, why is it so hush hush?

Seems like the American people would have some say in the sale of Government property, for they are the ones that own it and not only the President and a few of his special chosen men, giving it away.

Seems like if they sold the plants for what they were worth, they could give us the cut in taxes out of the difference in what they want to sell it for and what it is worth.

They are making money now, then why give them away for a little?

Well, I won't keep boring you with any more of this for I believe you know about it anyway.

If I am wrong in this, I would like to know it, but I will ask, what is to be done in this matter?

Sincerely,

AUGUSTUS S. BOSLEY.

P. S.—You are the only one I feel free to write to.

PORTLAND, OREG., March 13, 1955.

United States Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Of Oregon.

DEAR SENATOR: In the newspapers I read many things that happen in the Government which are quite disturbing to me.

According to my information the Government is going to give away all our synthetic rubber plants but one, to the big rubber and oil companies—or I should say "practically give away." The one exception is a plant which is not wanted by any of these rubber and oil companies. This giveaway is going to take place on the 26th of this month, unless someone in Congress puts a stop to it.

How about it, Senator?

Yours truly,

J. BREVET.

OREGON CITY, OREG., March 11, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: Something should be done if possible to block the sale of the Government synthetic rubber plants on March 26. Drew Pearson has the information on this.

Yours very truly,

MARTIN L. COWHERD.

GRESHAM, OREG., March 21, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I certainly am opposed to this giveaway program of the President. The taxpayers bought these synthetic rubber plants, and why shouldn't we have a voice concerning the disposal of them? I am really disappointed in our President. It seems he is really letting big business take over.

I heard someone remark the other day that "Senator WAYNE MORSE is presidential timber."

I am enclosing three clippings which I trust will interest you.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. P. O. RILEY.

[From the Gresham (Oreg.) Outlook of
March 10, 1955]

WHO ARE WE?

To the EDITOR:

In the February 17 issue of the Outlook there appears a paragraph in the editorial column that I feel needs either clarifying or modification. I quote:

"Interesting to note that national commentators on the political scene all agree that the placing of Senator NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN on three committees each was done more to curry favor with the voters than to honor these new Members of Congress or to recognize in them particular talents for the assignments."

It so happens that I follow the daily comments of Drew Pearson and Roscoe Drum-

mond and a dozen other commentators whose writings appear in weekly magazines and papers, and yet I cannot recall reading a derogatory remark about either Senator NEUBERGER or Mrs. GREEN. And goodness me, if anyone is adept at dragging out skeletons and rattling them, or at rigging up dirt, it's Drew Pearson.

What do you mean by the term "all?" All the Republicans, or all the commentators whose opinions coincide with yours?

You must remember that Senator NEUBERGER has been an author of articles and books for several years and no doubt many people all over the country have become acquainted with him through his writings. He also traveled a good deal.

As for EDITH GREEN—there is a saying that after 40 we are responsible for our face. And so, anyone who has seen EDITH GREEN or even her picture, will see in her the embodiment of high moral standards and honesty and kindness. She will never become well known by endorsing "Four Roses" or "always milder, better tasting," or by appearing before various men's organizations in a Bikini bathing suit. But I feel she will have the backing of men and women with children, or grandchildren, who want Government officials with adherence to the old-fashioned morals and Christian principles.

And this reminds me of an anecdote. Last summer when Mrs. Floyd Davis, of Gresham, was touring New England with her daughter from Pittsburgh, they eventually arrived in Washington, D. C.

An elderly, retired Army officer agreed to escort them around the city and give them the historical data.

When they arrived at the Senate Building, the guide pointed to a certain place and said, "That's where Senator MORSE stood and gave his 22½-hour (?) speech." Whereupon Mrs. Davis told the guide she was from Oregon and began apologizing. The guide then said, "Oh, don't apologize for him, we're mighty proud of the Senator here." (He didn't explain who the "we" is.)

Don't you think it would be a good idea if we took off our glasses and wiped off the political mud so that we might give a fair chance to those that are chosen by a majority of the people?

Mrs. ARTHUR DEMING,

TROUTDALE, OREG.

[From the Oregonian of March 8, 1955]

IS THIS FREEDOM?

To the EDITOR:

Some years ago De Tocqueville, of France, visited America and remarked: "I know of no country in which there is so little independence of mind and real freedom of discussion as in America."

Lord Northcliffe: "America is the home of the brave and the land of the free where each man does as he likes, and if he doesn't you make him."

One merely wonders what these two thinkers would have said had they been able to see us today when we have a license, a fee, a required permit, etc., to hunt, fish, park a car, to drive one, to own one, to be a citizen, to build a house, to lay bricks, to work, to conduct auction sales, to teach, to preach, and if things continue, there might be a required license to breathe and live.

As for taxes, never has history seen the like—excise, sur, Federal, State, county, city (is there a tax on taxes yet?), etc. I've barely mentioned some of the hedges, curbs, restrictions, checks, etc., that modern man is subject to. Perhaps, a great many more of these will be added in order to make it possible to live on such standards as we do. The big question, of course, arises, Is this freedom? Or the abuse of freedom?

One is reminded of the statement made during the French Revolution: "Oh, Lib-

erty, what crimes are committed in thy name." Or of what Napoleon once did in a rescript he issued: "I give you perfect liberty, but he who disobeys these rules will be summarily shot."

PAUL BRINKMAN, Jr.

[From the Oregonian]

TOO MUCH POWER

To the EDITOR:

I note that a bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives to abolish the State board of control and to put its institution-directing powers in the hands of the governor. Several of the sponsors of the bill are men of highest standing.

For some time, a bill has been pending in the California Legislature to abolish the treasurer, the controller, and those who have charge of the income-tax division and all offices relating to finance. Their bill, like this one proposed in Oregon, seems to have the purpose of throwing practically all the important matters of the State of California into one giant structure with the governor the supreme commander. He would make all appointments in the departments that would be merged into his keeping, with the accompaniment of power and patronage. If that measure passes it will give California a virtual one-man government.

We, in Oregon, are not too far removed from the pioneer state when men and women, too, were individually strong. When they laid the basis for our government, they certainly never envisioned any such plan as that proposed in this measure.

If one is looking for complete efficiency, the only way to achieve it is to vote ourselves into the Russian system where the ruler is in supreme command and the rest of the people don't have to bother about choosing their candidates or voicing any opinions.

If a majority of our legislators will pause and look at this proposed plan objectively, I think they will realize that, while we have a beneficent ruler in our governor now, there is no assurance that we will have that kind of person in the future. It would make the office of Governor of Oregon extremely attractive—to those who would abuse its power.

I plead earnestly with the able men and women in our Oregon Legislature who are intensely patriotic, who believe in the 2-party system, who believe in the system of checks and balances, to hold fast to the present board of control made up of the secretary of state, the State treasurer, and the governor.

Mrs. GEORGE GERLINGER.

COTTAGE GROVE, OREG., March 18, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is article by Drew Pearson I removed from the March 18 issue of the Portland (Oreg.) Journal.

The article is self-explanatory and my reason for forwarding same to you is that I, as a log trucker, am directly affected.

In the past 3 months, truck tires have had two 5-percent increases, and tire salesman tells me that another raise is expected in a week or 10 days.

Do hope that you will be able to dig into this and see if it is possible to stop these increases.

Respectfully yours,

RAY NEVIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., March 15, 1955.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: In reading Drew Pearson's article about giving the rubber plants away, I am wondering if the Congress is going to permit it to pass on March 26. We sure hope not.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. RALPH L. CARSON.

WEST LINN, OREG., March 14, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I admire the things you and Senator NEUBERGER are trying to do for Oregon as a State and for the small taxpayers in general. Therefore, I feel compelled to call to your attention the enclosed clipping and implore you to bring it to the attention of other representatives of the taxpayers.

Can't something be done about so many giveaways?

Yours for success,

Mr. and Mrs. EARL HEREFORD.

BIG RUBBER PLANT DEAL NEAR CLOSE

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—It has been ignored in the congressional hoopla over pay raises and tax cuts, but the Nation's rubber tycoons are quietly waiting for another type of windfall from Uncle Sam—all wrapped up and ready for delivery in 20 days.

The prize is 11 synthetic rubber plants, built by the Government at tremendous expense during World War II, but now about to be sold to private industry for a song.

For some time the rubber companies have cast a covetous eye on these profitable plants owned by the taxpayers. But now they won't have to wait much longer—due to a quirk of law and the anxiety of the Eisenhower administration to "get the Government out of business."

In 3 weeks—on March 27—the synthetic plants will be sold at bargain prices to a group of private companies unless Congress intervenes to stop the transaction. Strangest aspect of the deal is that a great majority of Senators and Representatives, busily occupied with the tax and pay-raise battles, is completely unaware of what is going on.

However, here are the facts:

The Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower to sell the Government's synthetic rubber plants, sent a letter to Congress on January 27 outlining the bill of sale to Firestone, Goodyear, United States Rubber Co. (subsidiary of General Motors), Goodrich, Shell Oil, Phillips Petroleum, and others.

Under the law the deal goes through 60 days later, or on March 27, unless either House of Congress adopts a disapproving resolution before the deadline. The proposed sale price for the 11 synthetic plants—about \$260 million—is far out of line with either their original cost or their current worth.

These factories made a profit of \$73 million for Uncle Sam a year ago, and with the Communists now in virtual control of Indo-China and inching rapidly down toward the vital rubber areas of southeast Asia, many military men feel this is no time for the Government to abandon its rubber factories.

Incidentally, not one single small-business concern is among the preferred purchasers selected by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission to take over these plants. Besides the big rubber companies, the list includes Sears, Roebuck, Texas Oil, Armstrong Rubber, Anaconda Copper, Endicott Johnson, and the American subsidiary of Dunlop Tires, Ltd., of Great Britain.

SID YATES, Democrat, of Illinois, a member of the House Small Business Committee, is making last-minute moves to stop the sale.

LYONS, OREG., March 21, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Why haven't we heard your voice in protest about the sale of these United States owned synthetic rubber plants?

Yours very truly,

EDWARD E. CRUSON.

FRANCIS G. CRUSON.

MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF MINING AND
TECHNOLOGY,

Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., March 19, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we express our full sympathy and appreciation to you for your efforts in behalf of the people's interest and investment in the synthetic rubber plants, and the opposition to their sale to the already monopoly sized rubber corporations.

We regret likewise the limited support which your efforts received, but it does put "on the record" the facts and information of trends and actions by these interests. And we hope these facts can be still marshalled for more effective opposition in the future.

Very truly yours,

Prof. MILTON E. SCHERER,

Chairman, Social Science Department,

M. C. M. T.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time taken in the call of the quorum be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is my extreme pleasure to announce to this body that the Congress of Industrial Organizations has now joined forces with the 3 million residents of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming who are actively supporting S. 500, a bill to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

This action is especially gratifying to me, because this great water development project is of primary interest to all of those who work in the 4-State Upper Basin and who would like to see that area expand industrially and economically to provide jobs to support the inevitable population growth of the future. It is a forward-looking economically sound program that all labor unions and anyone else interested in the welfare and security of America can support with full confidence.

The CIO news release announced that it had reversed its previous stand of opposition to the Echo Park unit of this great project. This indicates that another organization which has publicly opposed the project, because of misleading information issued by the southern California water lobby and by certain self-styled spokesmen for conservation

groups, has now taken a look at all the facts and concluded that it can support the project without reservation. More will do that between now and the time when the implementing measure comes before the Congress for a vote later this session.

I will have more to say in a day or two about the misstatements and misconceptions that have been deliberately fostered by people who would like to deprive 3 million people now living, and their descendants for untold generations to come, of vitally needed water.

Meanwhile, a grass roots citizens' group in our area has just compiled a list of statements by wildlife and conservation experts which indicate that this project already has generated considerable support from such individuals and groups throughout the country. I request unanimous consent to have these statements printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIO VOICES SUPPORT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ECHO PARK DAM IN COLORADO

CIO support for the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Echo Park, Colo., as part of the upper Colorado River storage project, has been voted by the CIO Committee on Power, Atomic Energy, and Resources Development, it was announced today by Chairman O. A. Knight.

Mr. Knight, who heads the CIO Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, said the decision followed an extensive meeting of the committee in Denver late last month.

In reversing its previous stand of opposition to the dam, Mr. Knight said the committee now supports the dam project as a means of securing maximum benefits of water for irrigation and municipal purposes, as well as the development of electric power for expansion of the upper Colorado Basin area.

Mr. Knight's statement:

"From a careful study of the facts which have been presented to me and my committee, I am persuaded that the maximum benefit to mankind will result from the earliest possible completion of the upper Colorado storage project including Echo Park Dam. The engineering prospects provide facilities for recreation for those now interested in the scenery and wildlife aspects of this area, as well as substantial regulation of the water flow in the river and a head of water for the production of electric power. This power is needed for the expanding population and industrial growth in the Mountain States. Salt Lake City, Utah, and Denver, Colo., and the total area between these two growing cities will greatly benefit from the earliest possible development of the total upper Colorado storage project."

HOW CONSERVATIONISTS FEEL

Here is what conservationists who are informed and acquainted with the area affected say about this proposed project.

The following resolution was adopted by the 11-State Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, May 5, 1954:

"Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, published in the Federal Register of July 20, 1938, specifically stipulated that 'the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904 * * * in

connection with the Green River project,' and

"Whereas the post-project wildlife and recreational values of the upper Colorado River project will be far greater than the undeveloped river now possesses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners go on record as approving the report of the Secretary of the Interior, recommending the development of the upper Colorado River storage project, including the construction of Echo Park Dam; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Budget Director and to the appropriate congressional committee."

Seth Gordon, California: Noteworthy at this 11-State meeting was the stand of the California representative, Seth Gordon. Mr. Gordon, one of the foremost conservation experts in the United States, not only voted for the Echo resolution but was instrumental in strengthening the original language.

"I know I'll get a lot of abuse from the Sierra Club out home in California," Mr. Gordon said. "However, when a thing is right, it is right and I have to stand up for it—abuse or no abuse."

"When Dinosaur Monument was enlarged, it was promised that it would not interfere with future water and power development and we cannot go back on a bargain."

Herbert F. Smart, Utah: Mr. Smart, secretary and former president of the Utah Wildlife Federation, Finance Commissioner of the State of Utah, and member of the Land Policy Committee of National Wildlife Federation, says:

"The Echo Park Reservoir will greatly enhance the wildlife and fisheries resources of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. It will improve our fisheries resources, aid our waterfowl population, increase our upland bird population when new irrigated lands are put under cultivation, and will not be detrimental to our big game. Conservationwise, construction of Echo Park Dam means that we will drown a few rocks in the lower levels of these high canyons (for which the country was named because of its superabundance of rocks) and by so doing materially increase our wildlife resources in a desert land."

Thomas L. Kimball, Colorado: After having biologists of the Colorado Game and Fish Department make an extensive study of post-project benefits from the construction of the Echo Park Dam, Thomas L. Kimball, director of Colorado Game and Fish Department, found the post-project fisheries benefits in the affected areas would be more than 50 times those found in the river in its present condition. He therefore concludes: "There can be no other conclusion drawn than the fact that the construction of Echo Park Dam would provide significant enhancement to the region from the fisheries standpoint." He further found there would be no material adverse effect on game and game birds and a probable great increase in waterfowl development.

Lester Bagley, Wyoming: Mr. Bagley, Game and Fish Director of the State of Wyoming, says: "I am firmly convinced that the area as it now stands is so inaccessible and will always remain so unless large sums of money are spent for roads—that wildlife potential would be increased many fold if these proposed dams were constructed."

J. Parry Egan, Utah: The director of Utah's Fish and Game Department, after study of the proposed project found a fisheries benefit many times in excess of what presently exists and no adverse effects on other wildlife. He is an enthusiastic supporter of the project from a conservation standpoint.

Leo Young, West Virginia: Editor, Wild Life Notes, the official publication of West Virginia's Sportsmen Limited, Inc., says, after

running an article favorable to the project: "Remember, those people who live out West know what they want."

Roy Despain, veteran professional Colorado River runner, makes this corroborative statement: "The proposed Echo Park Dam in Whirlpool Canyon would stop my river trips and my desire to have my posterity have this experience would be denied. Yet with this loss I feel that this project would create more beauty than it would destroy. Where in the world could a clear blue lake extending up this majestic gorge be duplicated? The possibility of adventure by boat on this body of water is exciting."

"Considering the limited number who are now able to take this river trip, as compared to the thousands who could enjoy it if it were developed, and considering the danger presently involved, I feel that if I were to oppose this dam I would be selfish and narrow minded. So I wish to add my support to this project and request that you do all in your power to assure the building of this dam."

Harry Aleson, Colorado River boatman, who knows the area like the palm of his hand, says:

"This Colorado River boatman has gained a little knowledge in the rugged domain where he earns his livelihood."

"Yet he feels that to fight against the building of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, irrigation projects, recreational areas would be highly unintelligent, even if for purely selfish reasons."

"To those who know, the building of an Echo Park Reservoir would inundate perhaps one-one hundredth part of the beauty of Dinosaur National Monument. It would spoil river running in the area for a handful of adventurers. On the other hand, within comparatively few years, the visitor count into the new recreational area would mount into the hundreds of thousands. These many persons would have ready access by lake and roads to this great beauty, where but a small handful visit now by river boats."

Mr. and Mrs. G. E. Untermann have been closely associated with the area for more than 30 years. They have mapped the geology of the entire area.

Mr. Untermann served as ranger-naturalist at Dinosaur National Monument for many years. At present, he is director of the Utah Field House of Natural History at Vernal, Utah. He says:

"Our lives have been devoted to conservation, and we see the need for the proposed project. We know the area and realize that its beauty won't be destroyed."

Mr. Untermann pointed out that the proposed project will not inundate dinosaur beds, despite the statements of some opponents of the project.

"The dinosaur quarry is miles downstream from the damsite and high above the river bed," according to Mr. Untermann. Actually, most fossils have been removed and placed in museums. About all that is left is a hole in the ground from where they came.

"It's amazing to me how irresponsible, misguided and uninformed some people are about this area," Mr. Untermann said.

"If this upper Colorado River situation could be resolved on a basis of merit, right, and justice, it would be materially simplified."

Speaking just before going to Washington to appear before the House Committee studying the upper Colorado River project, Mr. Untermann added:

"The task of obtaining approval of the project has become unnecessarily difficult because of the legal shenanigans, economic dishonesty, and emotional fantasies created by misguided 'conservationists.'"

"We will do all we can to contribute our wee mite to the clarification of this stupid

hullabaloo and get a bit of realism into the whole thing," he said.

Finis Mitchell, explorer and photographer, said he decided to photograph Lodore Canyon "because I read so much of how construction of the Echo Dam would forever flood and destroy the Dinosaur National Monument."

"I found such reports were utterly false and completely and deliberately misleading. Construction of the Echo Park Dam would merely make it possible for people to travel the canyon by boat in safety and view the entire monument. In other words, this dam would simply develop this monument to a point where people would have something to enjoy."

"From 2,000 to 2,600 feet of the canyon always will remain untouched, for people to view and enjoy, after the dams are built."

"The problem is to tell our story to the people of the United States."

George Harris, New Mexico: In letters to the editor, Deseret News, July 31, 1954, George Harris, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., writes:

"For several years I have been interested in the Echo Park Dam controversy, mainly siding with the 'conservationists,' although without too strong a conviction either way."

"During the past summer I visited this area again and included a trip down the Yampa from Lily Park to Echo Park, and I believe many of the arguments against the building of this dam are without a solid basis."

"The area involved in Dinosaur National Monument is classed as semidesert, with its accompaniment of deep dry gorges, a scrub type of vegetation, and comparatively little water. The dam itself would be confined, in the main, to a very narrow gorge, not much wider than the present river, and would still be below the rim of the confining canyon walls. The bulk of the monument would still be as inaccessible as it is today."

William E. Scheele, naturalist, Cleveland, accompanied a party of Clevelanders representing the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, and visited Dinosaur National Monument in search for dinosaur fossils in the summer of 1954. Writing for the Cleveland Post about their findings, Mr. Scheele (who is director of the Cleveland Museum) said:

"As we learned more about this country (Dinosaur National Monument), we became aware of a very deep current of feeling among the residents about the proposed Echo Park Dam. We were questioned within the Park and in Vernal by many citizens who felt that since we represented the Natural History Museum we must be against the proposed dam."

"I must admit that I had written so previously, but I must also admit that I was wrong in doing so. Seeing the country in which the canyon waters will be impounded we also saw the good that such stored waters could do this arid but fertile region."

"It was proven to us beyond doubt that many of the arguments that had been advanced by conservation groups opposing the dam were without basis in fact and the opposition unjustified."

"The Dinosaur Monument and adjacent beauty spots will not be spoiled by this dam and its impounded waters. In fact, the development of this lake will make the area 100 times more accessible to those who would like to see it, and the water will cover only 500 feet of a dangerous canyon bottom that is more than 2,700 feet deep."

"It seems as though 3 or 4 Far Western States are confusing the issue in their efforts to permit more water from the upper Colorado River to reach their own home States before it is distributed."

Dr. J. Leroy Kay, Pittsburgh, curator of vertebrate paleontology, Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, Pa. (who spent 8 years excavating dinosaurs in Dinosaur National Monument):

"I feel sure that the building of Echo Park and Split Mountain dams and the relieving of the dinosaur bones at the Dinosaur quarry will make the Dinosaur National Monument one of the outstanding attractions of our national parks and monuments."

Wildlife conservation organizations of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming have unanimously endorsed the Echo Park Dam. Other wildlife conservation groups of the mountain west have withdrawn their opposition.

The above statements from experts who know the proposed project or have visited it cover but one phase of the subject. Other benefits too numerous to mention here await the west and the Nation if Echo Park Dam and related projects in the upper Colorado River storage plan become realities.

Dr. Kay's complete testimony relative to Echo Park dam before the 1954 Senate hearings is appended herewith.

STATEMENT OF DR. J. LEROY KAY, CURATOR OF VERTEBRATE PALEONTOLOGY, CARNEGIE MUSEUM, PITTSBURGH, PA., BEFORE SENATE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, 1954 SENATE HEARING

Mr. KAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very grateful to you for calling me at this time so that I might catch my plane for Butte, Mont. I have commitments on the 1st with a party from Princeton University and one from the American Museum in New York to gather some data for the Geological Society of America. I cannot very well delay the arrival.

Senator WATKINS. You tell us who you are, I assume, in your statement.

Mr. KAY. I am J. LeRoy Kay, curator of vertebrate paleontology at the Carnegie Museum, in Pittsburgh, Pa. I spent 8 years excavating dinosaurs at the Dinosaur National Monument—1915–23—and several summers in the area since that time.

There has been considerable controversy in regard to the benefits and damage to the Dinosaur National Monument by the construction of Echo Park Dam within the confines of the monument. I have read with much interest the pros and cons of this controversy as I have a deep personal interest in the matter, having spent many years in the area as a paleontologist. During this time I visited by boat, horseback, and on foot most all of the present accessible places in the study of the natural history of the area.

In the early days of the controversy the opponents of the dam maintained that the backed-up waters would cover the dinosaur beds for which the monument was primarily established. This argument is no longer used as it is well known that the waters from the Echo Park Dam will not cover the dinosaur beds.

Senator WATKINS. How about the Split Mountain Dam? Will that cover them?

Mr. KAY. No. Now the argument seems to be that it will establish a precedent for invading other monuments and parks and will distract too much from the natural beauty of the area. The opponents suggest other dam sites to replace the one at Echo Park.

When the President, by proclamation, enlarged the original Dinosaur National Monument to take in the Green and Yampa River Canyons and adjacent areas, he reserved the right for the Reclamation Service to build a dam, called the Brown's Park Dam site, within the confines of the monument area. This dam site is on the Green River below Brown's Park and would flood the upper part of the canyon and Brown's Park. So, in building the Echo Park Dam it would only mean building it at a more strategic spot but in no way establishing more of a precedent than at the Brown's Park site. Actually, reclamation has priority over monument rights in the area.

At the present time the only way to visit the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers

is by boat and only by experienced river boatmen, so the only safe way for the tourist or vacationist to do this is to hire a boatman at considerable expense to take them through parts of the canyons, some parts not being safe for even an experienced boatman.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask you a question to qualify your testimony? Have you visited the Echo Park area?

Mr. KAY. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. More than once?

Mr. KAY. Many times.

Senator WATKINS. You were working in that area for how many years?

Mr. KAY. I was working there for 8 years steady and then I have been back nearly every summer since 1923.

Senator WATKINS. Are you a naturalist?

Mr. KAY. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. KAY. It is true that trails, or even roads, could be constructed to the canyon rims where people could view the canyons at a distance but few would ever see many miles of the canyon walls close up where they could study the geological structures and fauna and flora, both living and extinct. A number of people have gone through the canyons of Lodore, Yampa, Whirlpool, and Split Mountain by boat and a few have lost their lives in the attempt. Which is the better judgment—to preserve these canyons as they are for a few daredevils to have the thrill of shooting the rapids or thousands of people visting these canyons by boat on still water?

One only needs to compare the additional number of visitors that each year visit the areas of the Hoover Dam in Nevada, the Roosevelt Dam in Arizona, the Grand Coulee Dam in Washington, or the Fort Peck Dam in Montana, to mention a few, to see what the results will be at the Dinosaur National Monument if the Echo Park Dam is built.

The alternate dams proposed by the opponents of the Echo Park Dam would not control a considerable amount of tributary water which empties into the Green and Yampa Rivers between these and Echo Park Dam site. From a naturalist's standpoint, the rocks covered by the waters from the Echo Park Dam are of less importance than those that would be covered by the alternate dams. The waters from the Echo Park Dam would cover, for the most part, the lower section of the Lodore formation—a nonfossiliferous Paleozoic formation which occurs and is much more accessible outside the monument. The waters from the Cross Mountain and Brown's Park Dams would cover most of the Brown's Park formation, which is not known as any other place. Such vertebrate fossils as proboscideans, rhinoceroses, camels, and carnivores of Upper Miocene and Lower Miocene age have been collected from the Brown's Park formation.

Senator WATKINS. That is the site where it is claimed that the President reserved a right to build a reclamation dam is it not?

Mr. KAY. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. And where the opponents say they would not object to us now building a dam?

Mr. KAY. The opponents, yes, sir. Being the youngest consolidated sediments in the area the Brown's Park beds are an important key to the geological history of the area.

There are many unique natural resources in the upper Colorado drainage area which need electric power and water for development and some of these are strategic minerals.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask you this question: You heard the propositions for alternate dams. Suppose these alternates would be of equal value as far as the production of power and the saving of water is concerned to Echo Park. What would you, as a naturalist, do? Would you be willing to take the alternate dams or what would be your judgment

as to what should be done under those circumstances?

Mr. KAY. I would not take the alternate dams against the Echo Park Dam.

Senator WATKINS. Why?

Mr. KAY. Because the Echo Park Dam in my estimation is the only way, or dams within the park, to make traffic on still water for the many people that might visit the park possible, and the alternate dams outside the park would leave the tremendous burden on the national-park service which they wouldn't be able to meet; they don't have enough money to build roads, trails, or in any other way make the area, which is a beautiful area, accessible to a great many people.

Senator WATKINS. You have been at the dam site proposed for Echo Park?

Mr. KAY. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. What would be the situation there or what would it look like—I suppose you can project your mind to cover the situation—if the water were 525 feet deep at that point? What would happen to the scenery there?

Mr. KAY. The water impounded there, I think, would be about 500 feet. The dam is something like 525 or 550 feet high. There would be about four-fifths of the canyons as they are now still above the water if you built the Echo Park Dam and dammed the water to 500 feet. It would take 500 feet away from way over 2,000 feet at the dam site. And as it went up the river it would keep lowering on account of the stream, until when you got to the upper reaches of the stream, there would be a smaller amount of water.

Senator WATKINS. And the Lodore Canyon?

Mr. KAY. It would be 50 feet or so.

Senator WATKINS. Describe the canyon walls above it at that point.

Mr. KAY. It would be more than 2,000 feet above the water. Probably about 2,500 feet.

Senator WATKINS. What is the condition of the canyon floor at the present time from the standpoint of the scenic value?

Mr. KAY. There is one place where, as I stated, the Lodore formation which the Echo Park Dam would cover is better developed outside the monument than it is within the monument. We know nothing about it. It is nonfossiliferous. It would not cover all of the Lodore formation. It would cover about a third of it. There would be two-thirds of it above the water for future geologists to study. But the importance of the history of the area is found in the rocks above that. As the rocks of the earth's crust have been upheaved into a fold, which caused the Uintah Mountains, and by the way the only large mountain in the Western Hemisphere that runs east and west, it has thrown those rocks up and the last rocks deposited, whether they have been tilted or whether they have not been tilted, whether there is an unconformity between those and the rocks below, is the key to the history of when all of this upheaval took place.

So the rocks of the Brown's Park beds which the alternate beds would cover, is the key rock to the geology of the area.

Senator WATKINS. In other words, they ought to be trying to protect Brown's Park area rather than Echo Park?

Mr. KAY. That is why if I had the say-so, I wouldn't take the alternate dams in preference to Echo Park or Cross Mountain Dams.

Senator WATKINS. What vegetation grows on the canyon floor through the Echo Park area?

Mr. KAY. There are cottonwood all along the Colorado River. Along the sides there are some junipers, some bush brush, 1 or 2 berry bushes, like the buffalo berry bush, usually called the mulberry, and a few things like that.

Senator WATKINS. There are thousands of places in the West like that, are there not?

Mr. KAY. Yes; and within other parts of the monument that will not be covered by the water.

Senator WATKINS. What about the condition of the water through the area called Echo Park? I think that is a misnomer. I think it is a handicap the Reclamation has to overcome. The idea of many people is that Echo Park must be a park. That is just a geological name, is it not?

Mr. KAY. That is the name of that little area where the dam will be built.

Senator WATKINS. And was given to it by the first settlers, was it not?

Mr. KAY. Yes; given to it by the various first settlers. A lot of the area was named by Powell when he went down on his trip to the Colorado.

Senator WATKINS. What about the water with respect to carrying silt at that point?

Mr. KAY. Carrying silt? The USGS has been making estimates. I can remember when they were studying the silts in the water as far back as 1917. And they have been making studies since that time, about the silt. Of course, any obstruction that you put in there will retard the silt carried down the river.

Senator WATKINS. There is a naturalist in my own State, named Mark Anderson of Provo, Utah, who was a great conservationist. He described the river at that point as belching red mud. Would that be a correct description of it?

Mr. KAY. The river at that point, for most all of the year, is very heavily silted, and especially during high water. It sort of rolls instead of flows. But later on it clears up some in low water but never entirely. It carries a lot of silt. Naturally any stream that is with a gradient that great will carry silt.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. KAY. There are millions of tons of hydrocarbons such as gilsonite, wurtzilite, nigrile, tabbyite, iusterite, ozokerite.

That is the only place they are found in commercial quantities.

Senator WATKINS. You are talking about the area and not the canyon?

Mr. KAY. Most of those are found within a short distance of Echo Park.

Senator WATKINS. How far away?

Mr. KAY. As the crow flies, 15 or 20 miles.

Senator WATKINS. You are not indicating that any of these would be covered by water, are you?

Mr. KAY. No; they would not be covered by the water. It needs the water and the power for the development of those.

Senator WATKINS. They exist in the area 15 to 20 miles away from there?

Mr. KAY. Yes. Some of them are 75 miles away.

Senator ANDERSON. So that actually the construction of this dam will greatly assist in the development of strategic minerals?

Mr. KAY. It is the only way they can develop them. Not entirely because they need water for the milling of these, but they need water for the people who would develop them. I think my next statement will answer that.

It is estimated that at 1 place 800 million tons of bituminous sandstone occurs and there are many such outcrops of this material in the area. There are mountains of phosphate, iron, and large deposits of coal, copper, silver, lead, zinc, uranium, etc. Aside from the electric power that is needed for the development of these resources, many of the areas lack enough water for every culinary use, to say nothing of water for other uses for the development of these resources.

I think Senator WATKINS knows that for many years some of those towns have been hauling water in tanks drawn by horses for culinary purposes, and now some of them

are hauling it by truck. Now the water for drilling and so on is hauled by trucks, for great distances at great expense. Many of the towns have reached the peak of development due to the lack of water. The only practical way for many of these areas to acquire water for their future growth is from the development of the waters of the upper Colorado River.

It is estimated by the engineers of the United States Reclamation Service that the increased evaporation from the widespread waters of the alternate dams as against the narrow strips of water in the canyons from the Echo Park Dam would be considerable and while water is at a premium why waste it for sentimental reasons.

Probably 1,000 people have visited parts of the canyon areas of Dinosaur National Monument since the National Park Service took over and by far the majority, from various nature groups, visited there last year so they could say, for argument's sake, they had visited the area.

It is true that flooding the bottoms of the Green and Yampa River Canyons will change their appearance to some extent but there will still be a minimum of four-fifths of the canyon walls above the water, which will distract very little from the beauty of the area that is so glowingly described by the opponents of Echo Park Dam. To me there seems only one practical way to make an attractive area of Dinosaur National Monument so that it can be safely visited by the greatest number of people and that is to cover the present rapids with still water for safe boating.

If there are a few who would like the thrills of shooting the rapids let them try going through the Cross and Split Mountain Canyons and if they survive they will have something to tell their grandchildren.

Of course, the cost of building these dams would be prohibitive for the development of the monument for its scenic and educational values alone, but so long as it is practical to build the dams for irrigation, power, and conservation of water, and the power will pay most of the cost, why not build the dams where they will do the most good?

Senator WATKINS. When you say the most good, to what do you refer?

Mr. KAY. The development of the Dinosaur National Monument as well as for power and water which the district needs.

Senator WATKINS. And for the purpose of making it available to the millions of people instead of a few thousand.

Mr. KAY. Millions instead of a few hundred. I might state that for the last 2 years I have been through the gates of the canyon north of Helena, Mont., in a boat. They built a dam at Wolf Creek, at the lower end of the canyon, and flooded it with about 50 to 75 feet of water. The canyons are less than one-third the height of what the canyons would be, say Whirlpool Canyon or Lodore and Yampa, if the dams are built in the park, and yet last year, on Sunday that I was there, there were more people that went down that canyon to view those walls which are a few hundred feet to maybe at the most a thousand feet high, there are more people that went on that Sunday than have gone through the Whirlpool, Yampa, and Lodore Canyons in its entire history and it wasn't built for that purpose.

I feel sure that the building of Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Dam, and the relieving of the Dinosaur bones at the Dinosaur Quarry will make the Dinosaur National Monument one of the most outstanding attractions of our national parks and monuments, and that this can be accomplished in no other way.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions?

Thank you, Dr. Kay.

SALE OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 76) disapproving the sale of the rubber-producing facilities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not disposed to detain the Senate very long. It occurs to me, however, that the basic issue involved here can be summed up in about one question, namely, whether a major industry should remain nationalized when there is a profitable opportunity to get the Government out of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the remainder of my remarks for inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of of Mr. DIRKSEN's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For almost 15 years, the manufacture of synthetic rubber has been a Government monopoly. There were good reasons for it after Pearl Harbor, but this is 1955, almost 10 years after World War II.

If you vote to keep the rubber plants under Government ownership, would you vote to take over the steel industry, the aluminum industry, or the coal mines? Of course you wouldn't.

When we can recover over \$400 million for the Federal Treasury by the sale of the rubber plants, why are we hesitating?

Simply because advocates of public ownership are being heard again. Old arguments in new surroundings. They tell us we will be in the hands of big business monopolies. They ignore entirely the competitive aspects of American industry.

They suggest that the price of synthetic rubber will soar to fantastic figures under private ownership. What's keeping steel from going to \$200 a ton? What's keeping a Ford car from going to \$4,000? The answers are obvious.

The fact is that every country in the world would welcome the aggressive, hard-hitting competitive marketing that we have throughout the length and breadth of this land.

I submit that the buyers of these plants will direct that same knowhow and technical competence to the manufacture of synthetic rubber, when they acquire the plants. They testified that they were planning to spend millions of dollars to modernize these properties. These expenditures mean jobs. They mean building up the structure of American industry. They mean better products at lower cost.

No industrialist I ever heard of deliberately cut production to control price. He wants to run his plant at maximum capacity. These plant buyers have testified that they want to flood the market with rubber, and they have already started their salesmen out. They have solicited hundreds of small rubber fabricators for business at current prices charged by the Government.

I do not presume to know, nor can anyone know, how much money the buyers of these plants will make. I hope they make some. If and when they do not, we are in a depression. Depressions do not come along when people are making money. I am satisfied that no unreasonable profits will be made at the expense of the rubber consumer, whether he be large or small. Competition will take care of that.

And do not forget that for every profit dollar, Uncle Sam takes 52 cents. There has been a lot of loose talk about the Government profits in the synthetic rubber industry. Back in 1953, the Government did make about \$60 million, but of course it paid no Federal taxes. Neither did the Government pay its full share of local taxes to local tax authorities. Some people talk about \$60 million as an average profit. The Government has not come close to that figure before or since.

As a matter of fact, the total deficit of the Government since the plants were built, as of June 30 last year, is \$194 million. Add to this the net book value of the plants as they stand today, and it will be found that the recommended sales of the Commission will recover 96.6 percent of the Government's investment in the entire rubber program since its inception. I call this achievement "full fair value."

And yet we are told: "Do not hurry. There is plenty of time to get the Government out of the rubber business."

When is a better time than now? When will the plants be worth more? When they are twice as old as they are now? They are already 13 years old.

If we pass up this opportunity to sell the plants, I can see no time in the foreseeable future when we can dispose of them so advantageously. I think the Commission has done a wonderful job. Consider the record and experience of its personnel.

Holman D. Pettibone, of Chicago, is chairman of the Board of the Chicago Title & Trust Co. He has been with that company 44 years. He has sold millions of dollars of industrial property. As the Chairman of the Commission, he applied the same standards to selling the Government properties as he has in private transfer of property.

Leslie R. Rounds of New York is a retired First Vice President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He has dealt with business problems and balance sheets all his life. As a banker, he knows something about plant values, fair return on investment and depreciation charges.

Everett R. Cook of Memphis is a cotton merchant and exporter. He has been a shrewd trader in that commodity all his life. During World War II, he served as an Air Force colonel in the European theater. He is now a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. He paid particular attention to the national security aspects of sale of the rubber plants, and he concurs in the Commission's findings that the national security clause in the sales contracts give the Nation ample protection for any emergency.

Under Public Law 205, these three gentlemen could have no recent experience or connections with the rubber, chemical, or petroleum industries. They approached their assignment as competent, experienced business men. They've been at their job for 16 months. They surrounded themselves with capable experts in engineering and production. They went into every phase of the problem.

They are typical of many business executives who have come to Washington at the call of their Government. They have completed their task. Early in their assignment, they publicly stated that they would not recommend a "give-away" program. They said they would recommend no sale rather than do that.

Their report—unanimously made—speaks for itself. At no time has the Government ever obtained anywhere near the prices for surplus plants that it has received for these rubber facilities. The Commission got \$30 million more from the buyers than their original proposals offered. I call this astonishing negotiations.

Without exception, the plants went to the highest bidder.

In my opinion, the Commission met every criteria of the legislation which we passed in the 83d Congress. Full fair value, national security, establishment of a free, competitive industry, safeguards for adequate supplies of rubber for the small-business fabricator—all of these have been achieved as detailed in the Armed Services Committee report.

The Attorney General has approved the sales. His assistant, Judge Stanley Barnes, in charge of antitrust violations, has given his assurance that the least trace of monopoly practices will be a matter of immediate Government action. The Government has ample machinery to police the activities of business.

Industry alone built this country to its tremendous productive and economic power. Now we have the opportunity to turn loose competitive, creative, competent industries to the manufacture of synthetic rubber. Bear in mind, we are not talking about one industry. We are talking about three major industries as buyers of the plants—the rubber, chemical, and petroleum industries.

They are important contributors to our national wealth and welfare. They are guardians of our national defense. They have responded at every call our Government has sounded for assistance. They did, as a matter of record, develop the synthetic-rubber industry almost overnight with Government financing after Pearl Harbor.

They will continue to stand on guard, producing more and more of this vital rubber in the plants they will own and modernize. Their vast research programs foreshadow even more and better products. I say this disposal program is an evolutionary step in our economic progress in which this Congress should be proud to have played a part.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been brought to my attention today a statement which has been made before the House Armed Services Committee concerning the proposed sale of synthetic rubber plants to private owners. This statement was made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, the largest organization of its kind in the United States. Mr. Burger is also the Washington representative of that organization of established independent business houses throughout the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Burger's statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1955.
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: I believe it would be worth your while to review the attached.
Sincerely yours,
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

BURGER URGES CAUTION IN PLANT DISPOSAL PROGRAM—ASKS WHO WILL ASSURE ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT FAIR PRICES TO SMALLS—NOTES DANGER OF INFLUENCE BY INTERNATIONAL RUBBER GROWERS

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 15.—Following is the text of a statement by George Burger, submitted today to Representative CARL

VINSON, chairman, House Armed Services Committee, on the proposed sale of synthetic plants to private owners:

"In lieu of personal appearance before your committee now considering the disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber plants, will you kindly read this statement into the record of the hearings, and have it made a part of the permanent record?"

"We support all action to get the Government out of business in competition with private industry. However, with respect to this particular action, the Government operation has never been in competition with private industry, namely, in the overall production of synthetic rubber. The Government only moved in during the critical days of World War II, and through the action of the Government established definitely the productive satisfactory use of synthetic rubber."

"We believe in view of this that the Congress should move very cautiously from a national security standpoint before releasing these plants to private industry. We repeat, the Congress should move very cautiously."

"The writer has been an independent member of the rubber industry for close to 50 years, and is well acquainted with the actions of certain big interests in that industry to monopolize all segments of that industry. The Congress should be very careful of no "squeeze play" taking place which would bring about no real competition in the sale of synthetic versus crude rubber. If this should happen the public would be the victim of unfair practices."

"Who is going to control the distribution of synthetic rubber should the plants be sold to private industry, to see that the small factors in that industry will, at all times, get their equal share of synthetic rubber at the same price as the larger factors of the industry?"

"Small business is concerned, and rightfully so, as to whether so-called cartels or international price fixing on crude rubber will be utilized by private industry if they should become owners of the Government plants. This could happen unless proper safeguards are initiated by Congressional action."

"Due to the splendid results obtained through the Government-owned and operated synthetic rubber plants, the Government should continue its control of synthetic rubber insofar as research and development is concerned, so that all factors in the industry may have advantage of any progress made in these developments. This would be a very definite protection to the Nation as a whole and to small factors in the rubber industry."

"Our first interest is national security, and secondly, for small business."

"GEORGE J. BURGER."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to invite especial attention to 1 or 2 points which Mr. Burger raises in his comments concerning the proposed sale of these rubber plants at this particular time. He states:

We support all action to get the Government out of business in competition with private industry. However, with respect to this particular action, the Government operation has never been in competition with private industry, namely, in the overall production of synthetic rubber. The Government only moved in during the critical days of World War II, and through the action of the Government established definitely the productive satisfactory use of synthetic rubber."

We believe in view of this that the Congress should move very cautiously from a national security standpoint before releasing

SENATE

11. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Defeated, 39 to 52, H. R. 3952, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to provide for an increase in the 1955 national cotton acreage allotment of approximately 258,000 acres (pp. 3064-84).
Before voting on the bill, agreed to a modified committee amendment which struck out the provision providing further additional acreage equal to 1/2 of 1% of each State's share of the national acreage allotment apportioned prior to enactment of this bill, and provided further that, in drought areas or in other disaster areas, a farmer may transfer his allotment from one farm to another, and that no State allotment would be less than 3,500 acres (pp. 3064-83), after agreeing to the following amendments to the committee amendment:
By Sen. Stennis, 51 to 39, to increase each State's allotment by 1 1/2% (pp. 3064-81), after this amendment has been amended by an amendment by Sen. Hayden to provide that the cotton acreage allotments for Ill. and Nev. shall be increased to 3,500 acres and prescribing a minimum allotment of 10 acres to each eligible farm in Ariz. and N. Mex. (p. 3078).
By Sen. Case (for himself and Sen. Young), 47 to 43, increasing by 1 1/2% the 1955 wheat acreage allotment for each State (pp. 3081-2).
12. RECLAMATION; ELECTRIFICATION. A subcommittee voted to report to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, subject to final approval of certain language in several clarifying amendments, S. 500, authorizing the Colo. reclamation project (p. D244).
13. INFORMATION; EDUCATION; WEATHER CONTROL; RECLAMATION. Received various State legislature resolutions, etc., favoring development of fine arts programs and projects, prohibiting seeding of clouds or the use of other methods of inducing rain or snowfall until scientific data are collected to make other effective regulation possible, and favoring the Colo. reclamation project (pp. 3048-9).
14. PERSONNEL. Sen. Capehart spoke in favor of a pay increase for Federal postal and classified workers (pp. 3082-3).
15. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Wiley inserted several editorials favoring expansion of the capacity of the Welland Canal, discussing the importance of the connecting channels, and describing traffic potentialities on this seaway (pp. 3063-4).
16. POSTAL PAY INCREASE. Began debate on S. 1, to provide pay increases for postal employees (pp. 3084-93).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

17. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Church inserted an Ill. Agricultural Ass'n letter opposing H. R. 12, the proposed 90 percent price support bill (p. A2065).
Rep. Harrison, Neb., inserted two newspaper editorials opposing the above bill and an editorial, "Spanish Dairymen Irked Over U. S. Gift of Surplus," criticizing shipment of surplus powdered milk, butter, and cheese to the Spanish poor (p. A2085).
18. SCHOOL LUNCHES. Rep. Dorn inserted Harvey K. Allen's, Board of Education of the City of New York, letter urging increased appropriations for school lunch programs (pp. A2095-6).

March 24, 1955

-4-

BILLS INTRODUCED

19. PERSONNEL. S. 1542, by Sen. Johnston, S. C., to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3050).
H. R. 5204, by Rep. Ashley, relating to withholding on the compensation of Federal employees for purposes of the income taxes imposed by certain incorporated political subdivisions of States and Territories; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 3149).
20. SMALL BUSINESS. H. R. 5207, by Rep. Hill, "to amend the Small Business Act of 1953"; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 3149).
21. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. R. 5208, by Rep. Johnson, Calif., to authorize donations of surplus agricultural commodities to penal institutions where such donations will directly reduce expenditures from public funds; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3149).
22. FARM HOUSING. H. R. 5209, by Rep. Jones, Ala., to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 3149).
23. MONOPOLIES. H. R. 5213, by Rep. Keogh, to amend the act of Oct. 15, 1914, commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act, to make it applicable to sales of commodities made to governmental agencies for resale; to Judiciary Committee (p. 3149).
24. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. H. R. 5219, by Rep. Addonizio, to repeal title III of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 3149).
25. FLAMMABLE FABRICS. H. R. 5222, by Rep. Klein, to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt from its application scarves which do not present an unusual hazard; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 3149).
26. POSTAL SERVICE. H. R. 5225, by Rep. McGregor, to provide for the extension of rural delivery mail service; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3149).

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR MAR. 25: USDA appropriations, full H. A appropriations (exec). Disposal of surplus tobacco and soy beans, S. Agriculture.. 2nd supplemental appropriation bill, S. Appropriations.

oOo

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. House committee was authorized to report USDA appropriation bill by midnight Mar. 25; bill is to be debated Mon. House passed bill to redetermine burley tobacco allotments. House committee ordered reported bill to permit use of private stocks in exports under Public Law 480. House committee reported bill on farm housing loans. Senate defeated cotton-allotment increase bill after agreeing to wheat amendment. Senate subcommittee voted to report Colo. reclamation project bill. Sen. Capehart spoke in favor of pay increases for Federal employees.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 30, 1955
For actions of March 29, 1955
84th-1st, No. 56

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....10	Farm economy.....17	Reclamation.....11,27
Agricultural	Fees and charges.....5	Seed.....21
appropriations.....25	Foreign trade.....20	Statehood.....26
Alaska.....8,26	Forestry.....19	Surplus commodities.....1
Appropriations.....3,5,25	Fungible goods.....2	Tariffs.....13
Banking and currency.....15	Imports.....16	Textiles.....16
C.C.C.....1,2	Loans.....15	Trade agreements.....13
Commodity exchange.....2	farm.....28	Treaties.....6,24
Drought relief.....23	Loyalty Day.....4	Water pollution.....18
Economic report.....14	Monopolies.....7	Water resources.....8
Export-Import Bank.....15	Onions.....2	Wheat.....21
Exports.....1	Perishable commodities...2	Wildlife.....22
Family-size farms.....12	Price supports.....12	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bills to: Include onions under CEA; protect fungible goods purchasers from CCC claims. House committee reported bill to permit use of private stocks in exports under Public Law 480. Senate committee ordered reported Colo. reclamation project bill.

HOUSE

Committee

1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Agriculture/committee reported without amendment S. 752, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480, 83rd Cong.), so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from CCC stocks (H. Rept. 309) (p. 3335).
2. COMMODITY EXCHANGE; CCC CLAIMS. Passed without amendment H. R. 122, to include onions within the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (pp. 3307-8); and H. R. 1831, to amend the CCC Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from CCC claims (pp. 3307, 3310-1).
Rep. O'Hara, Ill., inserted a Chicago Potato Jobbers Association letter favoring a study "into the general question of a futures market in perishables with the thought of the possible enactment of further legislation covering the subject" (p. 3308).
3. APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee "refused to grant a rule waiving points of order against H. R. 5240, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1956" (p. D263).
4. LOYALTY DAY. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 184, to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day (p. 3307).
5. FEES AND CHARGES. Received an American Bar Association resolution "urging the repeal of title V, entitled 'Fees and Charges' of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act" (p. 3336).

March 29, 1955

-2-

6. TREATIES. Received a Knights of Columbus (Long Island, N. Y.) petition expressing support of the Bricker amend^{ment} to limit the President's treaty-making powers (p. 3336).
7. MONOPOLIES. Passed without amendment H. R. 3659, to increase the maximum fine which may be imposed upon conviction for each count of an indictment in a criminal suit for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act from \$5,000 to \$50,000 (pp. 3320-30), after rejecting amendments by Rep. Patman to increase further the maximum fine in the case of violations by corporations (pp. 3327-9).
8. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 3990, to authorize the Interior Department to investigate water resources projects in Alaska (p. D262).
9. RUBBER. Rep. Philbin claimed that the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission violated Public Law 205, 83rd Cong., when it accepted a lump-sum proposal from one company for certain facilities instead of a proposal enumerating the amount proposed to be paid for each facility to be purchased (pp. 3330-1).
10. RECESS. Agreed to H. Con. Res. 103, providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Monday, Apr. 4, they stand adjourned until Wed., Apr. 13 (p. 3334).

SENATE

11. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 500, to authorize the Colo. River reclamation project (p. D260).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. PRICE SUPPORTS; FAMILY-SIZE FARMS. Rep. Burdick inserted his letter explaining why he supported "full parity and the family-type farmer" (pp. A2218-9).
13. TRADE AGREEMENTS; TARIFFS. Rep. Lane inserted Prof. Seymour E. Harris' (Harvard Univ.) letter suggesting safeguards to H. R. 1 (the trade agreements bill) which would protect industries which experience much unemployment against tariff reductions (p. A2223).
14. ECONOMIC REPORT. Rep. Klein inserted Geo. Meany's, pres., AFL, ^{statement} discussing and criticizing the President's economic report and stating that "timidity rather than bold leadership is the outstanding characteristic of the report" (pp. A2199-201).
15. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. Rep. Multer inserted a Nat'l Foreign Council Trade letter criticizing certain statements made by the Hoover Commission in their report on lending agencies and requesting "that appropriate steps be taken to correct the erroneous impression conveyed by this report . . ." (pp. A2208-9).
16. TEXTILES; IMPORTS. Rep. Lane inserted a Textile Workers Union of America statement discussing problems confronting the textile industry due to loss of export markets and displacement by imports (pp. A2209-10).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

March 31, 1955
March 30, 1955
84th-1st, No. 57

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....1,3	Foreign aid.....4,16,32	Seed.....50
Adjournment.....23	Forestry.....19	Small business.....10
Appropriations....12,27,53	Fruits and vegetables...3	Standard time.....43
Atomic energy.....22	Grain.....37	Sugar.....35
Claims.....12	Health.....17	Surplus commodities.4,26,40
Commission.....8	Lands, reclamation	Surplus property.....61
Committee assignments....9	2,19,29,33,68	Tariffs.....14,48
Cotton.....3,26,57	Loans, farm.....55	Taxation.....14,25
Dairy industry.....45,60	Marketing.....41,50	Textiles.....48
Defense production.....46	Marketing quotas.....1,57	Tobacco.....1
Disaster relief.....3,55	Minerals.....20,56	Trade agreements..14,18,31
Electrification...11,29,52	Patents.....47	Treaties.....19
Ethics.....39	Personnel.....6,7,34,44	Water pollution.....49
Expenditures.....6,9	Prices, farm.....5	Water resources.....20,29
Experiment stations.....24	support.....36,38,40,59	Water utilization...15,19
Farm housing.....42	R.E.A.....51	Weed control.....20
Flood control.....28	Report.....13	Wheat.....26,36,50
Food reserve.....54	Roads.....21,30	Wool.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bills to: Redetermine burley tobacco allotments; preserve tobacco acreage history. Senate committee reported Colo. reclamation project bill. House passed independent offices appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on tax bill. Rep. Marshall claimed USDA has not used authority to dispose of surplus commodities. Both Houses received from USDA proposed bill to consolidate experiment stations legislation. Sen. Johnston discussed sale of surplus commodities abroad. Sen. Johnston urged increased cotton allotments and relief for fruit and vegetable growers in S. C. Sen. Humphrey deplored decline in farm prices.

SENATE

1. TOBACCO. Passed without amendment H. R. 4951, to redetermine the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-6 marketing year (pp. 3433, 3435-45). This bill will now be sent to the President. (For provisions of this bill as passed see Digest 53.)

Rejected a series of amendments submitted by Sen. Ervin to increase the exemption from acreage reduction from five-tenths of an acre to seven-tenths of an acre (pp. 3433-43) or from five-tenths of an acre to six-tenths of an acre (pp. 3443-4).

Sens. Gore, Clements, and Anderson discussed USDA's "miscalculation" in determining the tobacco marketing quotas on Nov. 1, 1954 (p. 3438).

Passed without amendment S. 11436, to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and to provide that the benefits of future increases in tobacco acreage allotments shall first be extended to farms on which there have been decreases in such allotments (pp. 3445-6).

March 30, 1955

-2-

2. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 500, to authorize the Colo. River reclamation project (S. Rept. 128) (p. 3397). The Committee was granted 10 days in which to file its report, together with the minority views of Sen. Kuchel and the separate views of Sen. Neuberger.
3. COTTON ALLOTMENTS; DISASTER RELIEF. Sen. Johnston urged an increase in cotton acreage allotments for S. C. farmers to "meet the deficits which will be sustained in the destruction of our ready money markets from peaches, vegetables, and fruits" due to the recent freezing weather and hailstorm; and inserted an editorial and telegram on this subject (pp. 3419-20).
4. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN AID. Sen. Johnston inserted and discussed a recent Washington Post and Times Herald article, "Benson Tells of Surplus Sold Abroad," and his (Sen. Johnston's) statement "which shows where the losses actually occurred" (pp. 3448-9).
5. FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey deplored the decline in farm product prices and inserted an Associated Press dispatch on this subject (p. 3449).
6. PERSONNEL; EXPENDITURES. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of February 1955 (pp. 3397-3401). This report is printed in the Record, together with Sen. Byrd's statement pointing out that there was a net increase of 312 employees as compared with the preceding month of January and ^{this} was the fourth monthly increase in 31 months since July 1952.
7. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment H. R. 4941, to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (p. 3446). (For provisions of this bill as passed see Digest 52.) The Foreign Relations Committee had reported, earlier in the day, without amendment this bill (S. Rept. 127) (p. 3397). This bill will now be sent to the President.
8. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMISSION. Sens. Schoeppel and Butler were appointed to be members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (pp. 3463-4).
9. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Sens. Ellender, Holland, and Dirksen (from Appropriations Committee) and Sens. Byrd, George, and Martin, Pa., (from Finance Committee) were appointed as members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (p. 3464).
10. SMALL BUSINESS. Received the annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business (S. Rept. 129) and Sens. Sparkman and Thye commended the work of this committee during the past year (p. 3401).
11. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger stated that the President "is not receiving accurate information with respect to the great power projects built under his predecessors," such as the Columbia River project, "which have been so valuable in electrifying our farms..." and inserted Gus Norwood's (N. W. Public Power Assoc'n.) address detailing the economics of Federally financed power projects (pp. 3446-8).

"1. That the United States contribution of \$8 million to the United Nations expanded technical assistance program for the period of January 1-June 30, 1955, approved by the Congress in 1954, be immediately appropriated.

"2. That a contribution of approximately \$25 million be appropriated to the United Nations expanded technical assistance program to cover the 18 months' period from July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1956, so that efficient long-range projects and plans can be effectively executed.

"At this juncture in world affairs the United States can neither risk loss of access to essential raw materials found in underdeveloped areas nor dissipate the good will built to a large degree on our record of helping others. Both our national interest and development of a freer more peaceful world require the continuation of United States participation in international technical assistance."

CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS — RESOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, there is continuing concern about the recommendations of the Hoover Commission task force to close certain Veterans' Administration hospitals.

This concern is particularly evident from those who live in the area of these hospitals and have knowledge of the important function these facilities are providing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Senate a resolution, adopted by the Warren Post No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, regarding the Outwood Veterans' Hospital at Dawson Springs, Ky., one of the hospitals mentioned in the Hoover Commission report, and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Warren Post, No. 23, American Legion, by and through its duly authorized committee on resolutions and pursuant to motion duly passed in a regular meeting of said organization on the 8th day of March 1955 adopts the following resolution:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of Warren Post, No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, that the Hoover Commission has made a report to the United States Congress in which it is recommended that a number of veterans' hospitals be closed because there are many beds and in some instances complete wards empty and not in use and that the small number of patients actually receiving treatment in these hospitals does not justify the expense to which the Government is put to keep said hospitals properly staffed and in operation; and

"Whereas Outwood facility, a veterans' hospital for the treatment of tuberculosis located near Dawson Springs, Ky., and being the hospital to which veterans from this area are sent, is one of the hospitals recommended by the Hoover Commission to be discontinued; and

"Whereas the members of Warren Post No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, individually, and as a body through the report of the chairman of their service committee, are reliably informed and have reason to believe that instead of being empty for nonuse and lack of patients, this said hospital is overcrowded and there is now and for some time has been a waiting list for the admission of veterans who need treatment for tubercular conditions; and

"Whereas the report of the Hoover Commission to Congress is erroneous and does not set forth the true condition of the said Outwood facility; and

"Whereas, if Congress adopts the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and closes the said Outwood facility injustice and great and irreparable damage will result to the veterans of this area, and particularly to those veterans now on the waiting list awaiting their turn to be admitted to said hospital for treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Warren Post, No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, do by these presents express our indignation for the recommendation of the Hoover Commission to the United States Congress, and do hereby endorse the action of the National Rehabilitation Conference of the American Legion in taking steps to counteract the recommendation of that committee and to present the true facts to the United States Congress; and it is further

Resolved, That the members of Warren Post No. 23 American Legion, Department of Kentucky, offer their grateful thanks in appreciation of the courtesy and cooperation of Hon EARL C. CLEMENTS, United States Senator for the State of Kentucky, and Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Congressman for the Second Congressional District, State of Kentucky, extended to the commander of the American Legion of the Department of Kentucky, Rodney Brown, and his staff while they were in Washington, D. C., engaged in negotiations concerning the report of the Hoover Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of Warren Post No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, request of the United States Congress that the recommendation of the Hoover Commission be rejected insofar as it relates to the closing of Outwood Facility."

AARON F. OUERFELT,
Commander.

Attest:

E. DAUGHERTY,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1217. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the sale of water from Clark Hill Reservoir; with an amendment (Rept. No. 126).

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 128)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably

with amendments the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee be given 10 days in which to file its report recommending that the bill, as amended, be passed, together with the minority views of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the separate views of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4941) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 127) thereon. The bill has passed the House without amendment, and the Committee on Foreign Relations has unanimously reported it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of February 1955 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY AND JANUARY 1955, AND PAY, JANUARY 1955 AND DECEMBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY
(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for February 1955 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In February numbered—	In January numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In January was—	In December was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total ¹	2,353,900	2,353,588	+312	\$779,256	\$904,338	—\$125,082
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,171,474	1,170,203	+1,271	392,765	485,997	—93,232
Department of Defense	1,182,426	1,183,385	—959	386,491	418,341	—31,850
Inside continental United States	2,129,229	2,126,018	+3,211			
Outside continental United States	224,671	227,567	—2,896			
Industrial employment	721,739	725,588	—3,849			
Foreign nationals	339,857	339,710	+147	25,780	26,394	—614

¹ Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1955, and comparison with January 1955, and pay for January 1955, and comparison with December 1954

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	71,330	70,920	410		21,967	24,053		2,086
Commerce ¹	43,816	44,406		650	16,886	22,579		5,693
Health, Education, and Welfare	38,450	37,918	532		13,439	14,257		818
Interior	49,992	49,543	449		18,105	19,590		1,485
Justice	30,256	30,303		47	12,684	13,806		1,121
Labor	4,913	4,891	22		2,024	2,215		197
Post Office	506,090	507,129		1,039	164,164	232,031		67,862
State	20,740	20,825		85	6,713	7,264		551
Treasury	82,182	80,418	1,764		30,095	33,316		3,221
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	270	267	3		140	145		5
Bureau of the Budget	425	428		3	260	273		13
Council of Economic Advisers	32	35		3	26	25	\$1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	68			21	25		4
National Security Council ²	27	27			15	16		1
Office of Defense Mobilization	296	292	4		145	152		7
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5			3	3		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	11	20		9	5	3	2	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission ³	4		4					
American Battle Monuments Commission	795	790	5		99	118		19
Atomic Energy Commission	6,040	6,012	28		2,861	2,933		72
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	556	582	4		243	269		26
Civil Aeronautics Board	534	532	2		272	291		19
Civil Service Commission	3,938	4,051		113	1,617	1,772		155
Commission of Fine Arts	3	3			1	1		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	61	63		2	26	31		5
Defense Transport Administration	16	17		1	8	11		3
Export-Import Bank of Washington	137	135	2		74	77		3
Farm Credit Administration	1,088	1,092		4	497	541		44
Federal Civil Defense Administration	700	698	2		319	363		44
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			7	5	2	
Federal Communications Commission	1,079	1,088		9	522	566		44
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,084	1,085		1	450	486		36
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	354	356		2	215	233		18
Federal Power Commission	626	625	1		303	331		28
Federal Trade Commission	587	591		4	306	328		22
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	176	175	1		77	105		28
Foreign Operations Administration	6,290	6,265	25		2,871	2,734	137	
General Accounting Office	5,773	5,771	2		2,313	2,524		211
General Services Administration	25,786	25,869		83	8,000	8,683		683
Government Contract Committee	10	14		4	4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,785	6,749	36		2,678	2,883		205
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,504	10,393	111		4,340	4,773		433
Indian Claims Commission	14	14			9	10		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,810	1,822		12	838	912		74
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	2	1		1		1	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,238	7,188	50		3,049	3,308		259
National Capital Housing Authority	283	285		2	92	92		
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21			9	10		1
National Gallery of Art	311	313		2	90	104		14
National Labor Relations Board	1,149	1,150		1	575	623		48
National Mediation Board	111	115		4	72	68	4	
National Science Foundation	175	178		3	81	88		7
National Security Training Commission	8	7	1		4	5		1
Panama Canal	15,618	15,638		20	3,398	3,480		82
Railroad Retirement Board	2,438	2,445		7	829	829		98
Renegotiation Board	584	596		12	335	369		34
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	21			13	15		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	20	18	2		11	11		
Securities and Exchange Commission	689	691		2	359	397		38
Selective Service System	7,136	7,146		10	1,564	1,730		166
Small Business Administration	749	757		8	368	413		45
Smithsonian Institution	640	633	7		209	236		27
Soldiers' Home	973	969	4		183	209		26
Subversive Activities Control Board	36	35	1		20	23		3
Tariff Commission	197	198		1	102	110		8
Tax Court of the United States	141	141			71	76		5
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,379	21,824		445	9,599	10,594		995

Footnotes at end of table.

84TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{REPORT
{No. 128

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE
PROJECT

REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE
TOGETHER WITH
SEPARATE AND MINORITY VIEWS
TO ACCOMPANY

S. 500

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE COLORADO
RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS
IN THE STATES OF ARIZONA, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO,
UTAH, AND WYOMING



MARCH 30 (legislative day MARCH 10), 1955.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, *Chairman*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming

W. KERR SCOTT, North Carolina

ALAN BIBLE, Nevada

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Colorado

GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California

FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona

STEWART FRENCH, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

RICHARD L. CALLAGHAN, *Chief Clerk*

N. D. MCSHERRY, *Assistant Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Colorado

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

MARCH 30 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 500]

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and with the recommendation that the bill, as amended, do pass. Senate 500 was introduced by Mr. Anderson and sponsored by the following nine other Senators: Mr. Allott, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Millikin, Mr. O'Mahoney, and Mr. Watkins.

Public hearings on S. 500 were held by the Committee on February 28, March 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1955. Some 57 witnesses appeared, including Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of Colorado, and many officials from other interested States. Testimony and exhibits submitted to the committee during the hearings comprise 734 printed pages.

1. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 500, as amended, has four principal purposes. First, it would authorize a series of holdover storage reservoirs, with hydropower plants and incidental works. Second, it would authorize a number of consumptive use irrigation projects. Third, it would recognize, with a view to laying a foundation for eventual further action by the Congress, certain units and projects in several stages of planning, but plans for which are not sufficiently advanced to warrant final and unconditional authorization. Finally, the bill recognizes that the works authorized constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive develop-

ment of the water resources apportioned to the Upper Basin and that the specific authorizations in this bill are not intended to limit or preclude the consideration and authorization by Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned under the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

2. BACKGROUND

The Colorado River Compact of 1922 divides the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the Upper Basin, comprising those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—

within which and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system above Lee Ferry (Colorado River Compact, art. II f)—

and the Lower Basin, comprising—

those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system below Lee Ferry (Colorado River Compact, art. II g).

Article III (a) of the compact apportions to each basin in perpetuity—

the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum * * *.

Article III (d) of the compact provides that the—

States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years * * *.

The Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) became effective in 1929 upon ratification of the compact by all States other than Arizona, the enactment of the California Limitation Act, and proclamation by the President.

The Upper Colorado River Basin Compact of 1948 apportions among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming the consumptive use of waters apportioned to the Upper Basin by the Colorado River Compact of 1922.

Lower Basin development has proceeded at a rapid pace with the construction of Hoover Dam and the Boulder Canyon project, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, and other works. Large populations in cities such as Los Angeles and San Diego, and extensive agricultural areas served by the Imperial Irrigation District, the Palo Verde District, and others create expanding uses of the waters of the Colorado River for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes.

Development in the Upper Basin States of the consumptive use of water awarded to that area by the original compact has been retarded while a comprehensive plan for the most efficient use of their waters has been in preparation, while the investigation and selection of the best dam sites has been under way, and while engineering and economic problems have been considered. The Upper Basin comprises an area of some 110,000 square miles. On its fringes lie such large centers of population as Albuquerque, Denver, and Salt Lake City and their environs, each of which has experienced rapid growth in

recent years; each of which anticipates additional significant growth, with ever more urgent need for water and power. In Wyoming, there are several counties in the southwestern part of the State also on the fringes of the basin, which are rich in natural resources. The Upper Basin proper has been primarily an agricultural area. Beginning with the Green River and its tributaries in Wyoming, it contains, however, important resources of uranium, vanadium, iron, and other metals, coal, oil, oil shale, and phosphates. It stands, the committee believes, on the verge of great industrial growth, with consequent increase in need for water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes, as well as for power.

The Colorado River is an erratic stream. The periods of high flow do not coincide with the periods of greatest demand on its waters. If, therefore, any substantial uninterrupted uses of available water are to be made by the upper division States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming), in addition to those small projects constructed prior to adoption of the compact, there must be provided a series of holdover storage reservoirs, which will assure compliance with article III (d) of the 1922 Compact and, at the same time, permit the Upper Basin States to achieve ultimate development of waters apportioned to them. As these waters are released, they will generate hydroelectric power, which can be used to advantage and for which there is a ready market throughout all the Colorado River Basin States. These reservoirs can at the same time provide recreational areas comparable to Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The repayment provisions of the bill, following very closely recommendations made by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior, are designed to achieve, so far as practicable, the concurrent return of expenditures for power and irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply purposes, insofar as expenditures therefor are made concurrently. The power and municipal and industrial water supply expenditures are returned with interest. All reimbursable costs are returnable within 50-year periods, and this is specifically required by section 4 of the bill as amended.

The committee considered whether litigation now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States between Arizona and California et al. raises any question affecting the advisability or propriety of the authorization at this time of the works herein recommended. The committee is convinced that nothing in such pending litigation warrants delay in authorization of the works proposed in the bill, and that such is the case even if Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming should be impleaded.

The works recommended by the Upper Colorado River Commission for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are fully justified because they are designed only to make effective part of the perpetual apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually made to the Upper Basin in the Colorado River Compact, and partake of the character of works heretofore authorized under the Federal reclamation program. The committee concludes that the authorization of this plan of development, being plainly within the Upper Basin apportionment, cannot and should not be construed as detri-

mental in any respect to the rightful interests of Arizona, California, or Nevada, as lower basin States, whether as litigants or otherwise. However, the committee calls attention to section 12 of the bill which makes it possible for any Colorado River Basin State to institute litigation promptly in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the event questions arise regarding the legality of the operation of any works herein authorized or of any other works on the river. Possible frustration of efforts effectively to litigate such questions is avoided by waiver of the immunity of the United States from such a suit. Thus, all States of the Colorado River Basin are fully protected against the operation of any works on the Colorado River system in contravention of the Colorado River Compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Mexican treaty. Furthermore, the provision contained in the bill (sec. 12 (b)) for consultation with an Advisory Committee in connection with the operation of works on the river will tend, as a practical matter, to obviate misunderstanding and to reduce occasions for litigation.

The Committee concluded that it was satisfactorily established by the evidence that the aggregate of the consumptive use of water that will be made, if all of the works hereby proposed to be authorized are eventually constructed after meeting the various conditions imposed, when added to consumptive use already being made in the upper division States, will amount to less than two-thirds of the apportionment made to the upper basin under the compact. When all storage units and participating projects named in this bill are constructed, the aggregate of all consumptive uses in the Upper Basin would not exceed 4.8 million acre-feet of water per annum. This would leave an unused apportionment of 2.7 million acre-feet of the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to the Upper Basin to meet any contingencies arising out of litigation over varying interpretations of the compact. In the circumstances, the continuity of the water supply for the Lower Basin would be assured.

The evidence showed that the difference in Upper Basin uses, derived, on the one hand, from the application of the diversions-less-returns method and, on the other, from the application of the inflow-outflow method of measuring consumptive use, accepting the most extreme estimates, cannot exceed half a million acre-feet. Therefore, the committee concluded that existing differences of opinion as to which theory or method of measuring uses should prevail have no bearing on the consideration of S. 500. The same conclusion was reached in connection with other questions, the answers to which depend on interpretation of the Colorado River Compact, the construction of treaties with Indian tribes, construction of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, or construction of the treaty with the United Mexican States. The evidence showed that even if all of the questions so raised by opponents of this measure were to be resolved against the upper division States, the requirements of the consumptive use projects authorized or proposed to be authorized would be well within the Upper Basin's apportionment.

Legislative proposals made in connection with the Colorado River storage project and participating projects are in general accord with the established policy followed by the Congress in connection with Federal reclamation projects for the last 50 years. In some respects such proposals are more conservative than established policy. Nor are they, in some respects, as generous as the Federal reclamation

legislation under which the Central Valley of California has prospered and hopes for further development. They are similar to the policies under which the Boulder Canyon project was developed. The understandable desire of certain Lower Basin entities for continuation of the status quo on the Colorado River cannot justify the Congress in longer delaying legitimate Upper Basin development.

The Committee concludes that the use of holdover storage reservoirs for river regulation is contemplated by the Colorado River compact. To accept the argument against holdover storage would be a negation of the compact itself. The committee's conclusions in this connection are amply supported by repeated statements by Hon. Herbert Hoover and other negotiators of the compact showing beyond doubt that river regulation through storage is implicit in the compact and that article III (e) of the Colorado River Compact relates only to arbitrary withholding of water.

The Committee likewise concludes that the suggestion that the compact requires the upper division States to deliver water of a particular quality is without merit. In any event the additional use of water involved in S. 500 will have no marked effect on the quality of water delivered to the Lower Basin. There may, in fact, be some improvement therein as a result of such development. So far as mineral content is concerned, exhaustive studies show that, as Mr. Julian Hinds, general manager and chief engineer of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California said in 1950:

Under the most unfavorable future conditions, (mineral content) will be lower than the average of waters diverted and successfully used in the Yuma and Imperial Valleys prior to the construction of Hoover Dam (p. 13, report of Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, October 1950).

4. PROJECT WORKS

Features in the plan for developing the Upper Colorado River Basin are divided into two categories: storage units and participating projects. This bill would authorize the initial phase of the plan. In this initial phase are the following storage units: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navajo; and the following participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, LaBarge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit), Pine River extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, Smith Fork, and, subject to further approval and authorization by Act of Congress, of feasibility reports before construction of the following additional participating projects: Battlement Mesa, Bluestone, Bostwick Park, Dallas Creek, Dolores, Eagle Divide, East River, Fruit Growers' Extension, Fruitland Mesa, Grand Mesa, Navajo, Ohio Creek, Parshall, Rabbit Ear, San Juan-Chama, Savery-Pot Hook, Sublette, Tomichi Creek, Troublesome, West Divide, and Woody Creek.

Brief descriptions of the physical features of these storage units and participating projects follow:

5. STORAGE UNITS

Curecanti (modified plan)

The Curecanti unit would consist of a reservoir on the Gunnison River formed by the Blue Mesa Dam below the town of Gunnison,

Colo., and of three downstream reservoirs respectively referred to as the Narrow Gauge, Morrow Point, and Crystal Reservoirs. The bill limits the water-surface elevation of the reservoir formed by Blue Mesa Dam to 7,520 feet. At this water-surface elevation, the capacity of the reservoir is estimated at 940,000 acre-feet. The three downstream reservoirs would be primarily for the development of power head with only nominal active storage capacities. Sufficient active capacity would be provided at the Morrow Point site for some seasonal regulation of stream inflows below Blue Mesa Dam.

Echo Park

The Echo Park Dam would be located in Colorado, on the Green River, about 3 miles east of the Utah-Colorado State line and 3 miles below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers. The Echo Park Dam is in the power market area of the Upper Basin States. Because of its strategic location below the junction of the Yampa and Green Rivers, and the large and efficient reservoir created by it, the construction and operation of the Echo Park unit would increase the effectiveness of supplementary storage and power developments at the Flaming Gorge and Juniper units and of the future Split Mountain and Gray Canyon units. The Echo Park Dam would be a curved, gravity type, concrete structure rising 690 feet above bedrock. The reservoir would have a storage capacity of 6,460,000 acre-feet, and the powerplant a generating capacity of 200,000 kilowatts.

The Committee recognizes that the opposition to Echo Park Dam stems from individuals who sincerely believe that the authorization of this dam would be an "invasion" of Dinosaur National Monument and constitute a precedent detrimental to other units of the national parks system. However, the committee and the Congress have been provided with documentary evidence which shows conclusively that a tremendous acreage—virtually the complete course of the Green and Yampa Rivers and bordering lands—within the present monument boundaries was reserved for water and power development from 13 to 34 years before the 2,500-fold extension of Dinosaur Monument in 1938. Furthermore, these reservations for water resource development are still valid and in effect today—clearly exempted by the language of the 1938 Dinosaur Monument proclamation; this language is unique in proclamations and laws pertaining to parks and monuments. These documents, some of which were introduced in the House hearings in 1954, have not been refuted.

The Echo Park Dam site has many advantages as a component of the initial phase of the project. To deny now the use of the Echo Park site for that purpose would amount to a breach of faith on the part of the Government. Such denial would tend to weaken reclamation and power reservations now applying to public lands on many other streams in the western United States.

After hearing much testimony on both sides of the question, the committee concludes that there is no invasion of national park or monument areas. In view of these legal and historical precedents for priority use of the Green and Yampa Rivers for water resource development, and in view of the obvious fact that water is so precious in the semiarid Colorado River Basin, the decision must be in favor of the selection of that site (Echo Park) where evaporation losses are reduced by a significant amount. Furthermore, there is urgent need

for the orderly development of the land and water resources of the Colorado River Basin.

Flaming Gorge

The principal feature of the Flaming Gorge unit is the dam, which will be located on the Green River in Utah, about 32 miles north of Vernal, and which would be a concrete, gravity-type structure rising 440 feet above the river. Flaming Gorge Reservoir formed by the dam would have a total capacity of 3,940,000 acre-feet. The powerplant at the dam would have a capacity of 72,000 kilowatts.

Glen Canyon

The Glen Canyon Dam would be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 15 miles upstream from Lee Ferry—the division point between the lower and upper basins. It would be a concrete, curved, gravity-type structure rising 700 feet above bedrock. The reservoir, with a total capacity of 26 million acre-feet, would provide final regulation for deliveries to the lower basin under the Colorado River compact. The powerplant would be located near the toe of the dam. It would have a total installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts.

Juniper

This storage and diversion unit is substituted for Cross Mountain Dam in the development plan. The dam would be located on the Yampa River 24 miles downstream from Craig, Colo., and 10 miles upstream from Maybell, Colo. The reservoir would have a capacity of 1,500,000 acre-feet, and a powerplant of 25,000 kilowatt capacity would be installed. Diversions through a canal would irrigate approximately 29,000 acres of new land in Colorado and 61,000 acres of new land in Utah between the Yampa and White Rivers.

Navajo

The Navajo Dam would be located on the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico about 34 miles east of the town of Farmington. The dam would be a rolled, earth-filled embankment rising 335 feet above stream bed. Navajo Reservoir would have a total capacity of 1,450,000 acre-feet. The dam and reservoir will provide for gravity diversion for white and Indian lands to be irrigated under the Navajo project. Also, in connection with the San Juan-Chama project, the reservoir would constitute a source of supply for downstream irrigation users in exchange for natural flow diverted upstream.

6. PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Central Utah

The Central Utah project (initial phase) is located in the eastern Bonneville Basin in central Utah and in the Uinta Basin, part of the Colorado River Basin in northeastern Utah. The plan would include construction of the Strawberry aqueduct along the south slope of the Uinta Mountains for intercepting Uinta Basin streams as far east as Rock Creek, enlargement of the Strawberry Reservoir by construction of the Soldier Creek Dam, enlargement of the Strawberry Reservoir outlet tunnel, construction of five powerplants with a combined generating capacity of 61,000 kilowatts, and construction of a number of other reservoirs for regulation, storage, and water exchanges.

The Wasatch aqueduct, canals, and distribution system would be constructed as necessary to deliver and utilize the increased water supply. Drainage would be provided where necessary. The project would irrigate about 28,540 acres of new land. It would also supply supplemental water for about 131,840 acres and furnish 48,800 acre-feet of municipal water.

Emery County

The Emery County project is located in east-central Utah along the San Rafael River. The project works would include a dam and reservoir, a diversion dam, a canal, and laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 3,630 acres of new land and furnish supplemental water for about 20,450 acres.

Florida

The Florida project is in southwestern Colorado, in the Florida River Valley. Project works would include a dam and reservoir, a diversion dam, enlargement and extension of existing canal, and distribution laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 6,300 acres of new land and furnish supplemental water to about 12,650 acres.

Gooseberry

The Gooseberry project would be located in central Utah. It would consist of a storage reservoir on Gooseberry Creek, a tributary to the Colorado River, having a capacity of 17,200 acre-feet, a 2½-mile tunnel to San Pete Valley in the Bonneville Basin, a diversion dam and high-line canal to deliver the water to existing distribution systems. It would furnish supplemental water for 16,400 acres of irrigated lands now having an inadequate water supply.

Hammond

The Hammond project is in northwestern New Mexico along the San Juan River. The project works would include a diversion dam, a canal, and distribution laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 3,670 acres of new land.

LaBarge

The LaBarge project is in southwestern Wyoming in the upper end of the Colorado River Basin. It extends approximately 40 miles along the west side of Green River. Project works would include a diversion, a conveyance canal, and distribution laterals. About 7,970 acres of new land would be irrigated by this project.

Lyman

The Lyman project is in southwestern Wyoming, just above the Utah-Wyoming State line. It lies along Blacks Fork, a tributary of the Green River. Project works include a reservoir, conveyance canals, and drainage facilities. Supplemental water would be furnished to about 40,600 acres.

Paonia

The Paonia project is located in west-central Colorado on the North Fork of the Gunnison River. This project was previously authorized and is partially constructed. It would, however, be extended by this reauthorization. The project works include a dam and reservoir, canals, and siphon. As reauthorized, the area to be served would

include 17,040 acres, of which 2,210 would be new land and 14,830 acres would be furnished supplemental water.

Pine River extension

The Pine River extension is in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico, on Pine River, 20 miles east of Durango, Colo. The project works include a diversion dam, the enlargement and extension of canals, and a number of distribution laterals. The project would irrigate about 15,150 acres of new land. Storage water is to be obtained from existing Vallecito Dam and Reservoir on Pine River.

Seedskadee

The Seedskadee project is in southwestern Wyoming along the Green River below the LaBarge project. Project works would include a diversion dam, conveyance canals, and distribution laterals. About 60,720 acres of new land would be irrigated by the project.

Silt

The Silt project is located in west-central Colorado between Rifle and Elk Creeks. The project works include a dam, and reservoir pumping system, rehabilitation of existing canal, and construction of some new laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 1,900 acres of new land and would furnish supplemental water for about 5,400 acres.

Smith Fork

The Smith Fork project is located in west-central Colorado along Smith Fork, a tributary of the Gunnison River. The project works would include a dam and reservoir, diversion dam, canals, and laterals. The project would irrigate about 2,270 acres of new land and furnish supplemental water for about 8,160 acres.

PARTICIPATING PROJECTS CONDITIONALLY AUTHORIZED

The following participating projects would be authorized now, conditioned on approval of feasibility reports by Act of Congress before construction could begin:

A brief description of these projects is as follows:

Battlement Mesa, Colorado	Ohio Creek, Colorado
Bluestone, Colorado	Parshall, Colorado
Bostwick Park, Colorado	Rabbit Ear, Colorado
Dallas Creek, Colorado	San-Juan Chama, New Mexico
Dolores, Colorado	Savery-Pot Hook, Colorado and
Eagle Divide, Colorado	Wyoming
East River, Colorado	Sublette, Wyoming
Fruit Growers' Extension, Colorado	Tomichi Creek, Colorado
Fruitland Mesa, Colorado	Troublesome, Colorado
Grand Mesa, Colorado	West Divide, Colorado
Navajo, New Mexico	Woody Creek, Colorado

Battlement Mesa

The Battlement Mesa project in Mesa County, west-central Colorado, would regulate the surplus runoff in Buzzard Creek of the Upper Colorado River drainage and two branches of Muddy Creek

of the Gunnison River drainage to provide for the irrigation of 6,780 acres of full service land and 50 acres of supplemental service land located on the south slope of Battlement Mesa near the town of Collbran, Colo. The project would also aid in fishery and wildlife conservation.

Bluestone

The Bluestone project in Garfield and Mesa Counties, west-central Colorado, would divert water from Colorado River to provide for the irrigation of 8,660 acres of new land and 2,215 acres of supplemental service land located in the Colorado River Valley between the town of Rifle and the head of De Beque Canyon near De Beque, Colo.

Bostwick Park

The Bostwick Park project would provide a water supply for 1,040 acres of arable nonirrigated lands and supplemental water for 5,830 acres of presently irrigated lands. The lands are located along the west side of Cimarron Creek below the existing Cimarron Canal and in Bostwick and Shin Parks which lie about 10 miles east of the city of Montrose and also obtain their water supply through the Cimarron Canal. The source of the water supply for the project would be Cimarron Creek, a tributary of Gunnison River in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Dallas Creek

The Dallas Creek project would provide an irrigation supply for 15,750 acres of arable nonirrigated lands and supplemental water for 6,190 acres of irrigated lands. The lands are located in the drainage basin of the Uncompahgre River, a tributary of Gunnison River in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The water supply for the project would be made available through utilization of surplus flows of Uncompahgre River and two of its tributaries, Dallas Creek and Cow Creek.

Dolores

The Dolores project is planned primarily to store and divert waters of Dolores River to supply irrigation water for 66,000 acres of land in the San Juan River Basin in southwestern Colorado. The lands include 30,550 acres presently irrigated with only a partial water supply and 35,450 acres not now irrigated. The project lands lie near the towns of Cortez and Dove Creek, Colo.

Eagle Divide

The Eagle Divide project in Eagle County, northwestern Colorado, would regulate surplus runoff in Piney River, tributary to the Colorado River, and would divert surplus flows from several small streams, tributaries to the Piney and Colorado Rivers below the planned reservoir, to provide for the irrigation of 8,990 acres of new land and 1,885 acres of supplemental service land. The project lands are located on the divide between the Eagle and Colorado Rivers in the vicinity of the following towns: Eagle, Wolcott, McCoy, and Burns. The project would increase fishery, wildlife, and recreational values of the area.

East River

Development of the potential East River project would provide for irrigation of 1,780 acres of nonirrigated lands and would provide

supplemental water for 970 acres of presently irrigated lands north of the town of Gunnison in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The water would be made available through construction of the 5-mile East River Canal which would divert from East River, one of the upper tributaries of Gunnison River. No storage facilities would be required to provide an adequate water supply for lands of the project.

Fruit Growers' Extension

The Fruit Growers' Dam project extension would utilize surplus flows of Grand Mesa tributaries of the Gunnison River in the Upper Colorado River Basin to provide supplemental irrigation water for 2,000 acres of presently irrigated lands and a new water supply for 1,850 acres of nonirrigated lands.

Fruitland Mesa

The Fruitland Mesa project would provide a water supply for 11,700 acres of arable nonirrigated land and supplemental water for 7,700 acres of presently irrigated land between the town of Crawford and the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument. The water supply would be made available from Sapinero, Curecanti, Crystal, and Iron Creeks, tributaries of Gunnison River in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Grand Mesa

The Grand Mesa project would provide a water supply for 11,070 acres of arable nonirrigated land and supplemental water for 14,230 acres of irrigated land in the Gunnison River drainage of the Upper Colorado River Basin. These acreages include nearly all of the lands along the south slope of Grand Mesa except lands included in the service areas of the potential Paonia project and the Fruit Growers Dam project extension. The water supply for the project would be made available from Muddy Creek and other Grand Mesa tributaries of Gunnison River.

Navajo

The Navajo project (formerly called the Shiprock and south San Juan projects) is in northwestern New Mexico along the San Juan River. The project would provide for the irrigation of 151,000 acres of new lands in the vicinity of the towns of Bloomfield, Farmington, and Shiprock. Of that total, 122,000 acres are located in the Navajo Indian Reservation and 29,000 acres are outside the reservation. A main high-line canal from the Navajo Reservoir would extend 28 miles to a drop and direct-connected turbine pump for service of highlands and then 60 miles to serve the major portion of the lands by gravity. A distribution system and drains also are planned. With respect to the authorization of this project, see section 2 of the bill.

Ohio Creek

The Ohio Creek project would provide for the irrigation of 6,200 acres of arable nonirrigated land and 10,710 acres of irrigated land in need of additional water. The source of the water would be Ohio Creek, a Gunnison River tributary in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Parshall

The Parshall project would provide for the full irrigation of 24,410 acres of new land and would supply supplemental water to 3,100 acres of partially irrigated land along Williams River, Little Muddy Creek, and the lower east side of the Blue River Valley in the vicinity of the communities of Parshall and Kremmling, Grand and Summit Counties in north-central Colorado. The project would also aid in fishery and wildlife conservation.

Rabbit Ear

The Rabbit Ear project in Grand County, north-central Colorado, would regulate surplus runoff of Muddy Creek, tributary to the Colorado River near Kremmling, Colo., to provide for the irrigation of 13,955 acres of new service land and 5,235 acres of supplemental service land. The project lands are located in the Muddy Creek drainage, south and west of Kremmling. The project would also provide some flood-control benefits and also increase fishery and wildlife values.

San Juan-Chama

The San Juan-Chama project would be located in northern New Mexico partly in the San Juan Basin of southern Colorado and partly in the Rio Grande and Canadian River Basins in northern New Mexico. This project would provide for a maximum diversion of 235,000 acre-feet of water annually from the headwaters of the San Juan River through a collection system and a tunnel to the headwaters of the Chama, a tributary of the Rio Grande. An off-channel holding and regulatory reservoir would be provided on the Chama watershed. The water would be delivered to the agricultural users through the distribution systems of existing projects. With respect to the authorization of this project, see section 2 of the bill.

Savery-Pot Hook

The Savery-Pot Hook project would provide supplemental irrigation water for 13,230 acres of presently irrigated lands and a new supply for 18,380 acres of nonirrigated lands located in northwestern Colorado and south-central Wyoming. The additional water would be made available through utilization of surplus flows of streams of the Little Snake River Valley, a part of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Sublette

The Sublette project is planned to store and divert waters of the upper Green River and its tributaries to supply irrigation water for about 72,000 acres of undeveloped lands and 12,000 acres of lands presently irrigated with an inadequate supply. The plan also includes a small hydroelectric powerplant. The project would be located in the Green River Basin in Sublette County, western Wyoming. Although reconnaissance studies to date indicate that the project would consist of two independent divisions (Buckskin and West Side divisions), the data presented herein are for the overall project.

Tomichi Creek

The Tomiehi Creek project would provide supplemental irrigation water for 15,400 acres of presently irrigated land and a new supply

for 12,180 acres of arable nonirrigated land located east of the town of Gunnison near the Continental Divide. Water would be made available from Tomichi and Quartz Creeks, tributaries of Gunnison River in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Troublesome

The Troublesome project in Grand County, north-central Colorado, would regulate surplus runoff in East Troublesome Creek, tributary to the Colorado River, and would divert surplus flows of the Williams River at the existing Williams Reservoir to provide for the irrigation of 8,990 acres of new land and 4,650 acres of supplemental service land. The project lands are located in the Troublesome Creek Valley and on river benches north of the Colorado River between the towns of Parshall and Kremmling, Colo. The project would also increase fishery, wildlife, and recreational values of the area.

West Divide

The West Divide project would regulate and divert surplus runoff of Crystal River, Thompson Creek, West Divide Creek, and Mamm Creek and would divert surplus runoff of several tributaries of the Roaring Fork and Colorado Rivers in order to provide for the irrigation of 40,500 acres of new land and 25,110 acres of supplemental service land. The lands are located along the west side of the Roaring Fork drainage in the vicinity of Carbondale and Glenwood Springs, Colo., and along the south side of the Colorado River Valley in the vicinity of the towns of New Castle, Silt, Rifle, Grand Valley, and DeBeque, Colo. The project area is contained in Pitkin, Garfield, and Mesa Counties, west-central Colorado.

Woody Creek

The Woody Creek project would provide an average of 3,900 acre-feet of water annually for the irrigation of 645 acres of new service land and 2,320 acres of supplemental service land located along the east side of the Roaring Fork River Valley and north of the town of Aspen, Pitkin County, west-central Colorado.

7. OTHER FEATURES OF THE BILL

The Committee recognizes that it may be found desirable to authorize additional storage in the upper reaches of the Colorado River and its tributaries above Grand Junction, Colo., and of additional participating projects in the several upper division States (see sec. 2 of the bill); but it recommends deferment of any commitment by the Congress thereto, due to the fact that engineering reports are not complete.

The bill contains a provision authorizing the appropriate agencies of the United States to convey for value to the city and county of Denver, Colo., water rights and interests in lands required for the enlargement of that city's municipal water supply.

The Committee believes that the Colorado River storage project and participating projects plan is financially sound. It has been subjected to the most rigid economic and financial analyses. Less than 3 percent of the total cost is nonreimbursable for flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

The entire cost of the power and municipal water features will be returned to the United States Treasury with interest not only on the capital investment but also with interest accruing during their construction. Interest would be computed at the going rate for long-term Treasury obligations. The irrigation costs do not bear interest, pursuant to the 50-year-old policy of the reclamation law. The Federal Government has recognized that the development of irrigated lands stabilizes the agricultural economy and is a good public investment.

Section 3 of the bill, relating to water conservancy districts, takes into account the indirect benefits that will accrue to the general areas served by these projects. Indirect beneficiaries in the service areas of these projects would thereby aid in the repayment of irrigation costs. The irrigation farmers would be assessed, according to their ability to pay over a 50-year period, and the balance of the costs allocated to irrigation would be repaid by power revenues. Safeguards are contained in the bill to obviate initiation of construction of participating projects prior to a thorough review of their economic justification.

The committee concurs in the view expressed by the Civil Defense Administrator, that the Colorado River storage project will be an important factor in an industrial and human dispersal program in the event of a national emergency. This vital factor gives added nationwide importance to this development, in addition to broadening the Federal tax base, increasing purchasing power, and thereby providing an expanding home market for the products of American manufacturing and other enterprises.

The committee's position on power marketing of the project is that the area to be served shall be governed only by economical transmission distance direct or through interconnections with other plants either in the Upper or Lower Basin. This policy is necessary to the economic and financial health of the project. This policy in the committee's opinion accords with established practice and policies of reclamation power operations. The committee intends that full equality of treatment be accorded to both Upper and Lower Basin power customers. Established preferences and sound business principles in accordance with existing reclamation law are intended to be applied in the marketing of power from the project, and it is not intended that Lower Basin customers should be discriminated against in any respect.

The principal amendments recommended are for the purpose of clarification only and relate, first, to the inclusion of 19 additional participating projects in Colorado and Wyoming which can be constructed only after submittal of feasibility reports, and approval and authorization by the Congress. Section 2 is revised to declare that it is not the intention of Congress by authorizing only certain designated projects at this time to preclude future comprehensive water resource developments in the Upper Basin. A provision is included for consultation by the Secretary of the Interior with an Advisory Committee in connection with the operation of works in the Colorado River.

Section 12 of the bill would grant consent to suits against the United States in the Supreme Court by States in the Colorado River Basin to enforce the provisions of specifically named compacts,

projects, Federal statutes, and treaties relating to the release of water from reservoirs in the basin. In order to make certain that the immunity waiver would permit such suits both in a State's own quasi-sovereign capacity and on behalf of those of its political subdivisions that might have water rights under the compacts, projects, or statutes enumerated, the committee amended the section to give legislative recognition to the established judicial doctrine of *parens patriae*.

The waiver of the sovereign immunity of the United States goes only to suits brought by the basin States and not to suits by any other political entity; action would have to be brought by the State itself, and determination as to whether to bring action as *parens patriae* would rest with the State.

For an exposition of the *parens patriae* doctrine, as it relates to the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, reference is made to such cases as *Georgia v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co. et al.* (324 U. S. 401; 1945); *Kansas v. Colorado* (206 U. S. 46; 1906); or *Missouri v. Illinois* (180 U. S. 208; 1900).

8. ESTIMATED OVERALL CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The estimated overall construction costs of the projects under each of the several categories set forth in S. 500, as amended, are as follows:

Storage units:

Authorized for construction (5)-----	\$733, 578, 000
Authorized subject to report to Congress (1)-----	49, 305, 000

Total storage units (6)-----	782, 883, 000
------------------------------	---------------

Participating projects: Authorized subject to supplemental reports (12)-----	310, 116, 800
--	---------------

Total projects authorized in S. 500, as amended-----	1, 092, 999, 800
--	------------------

Participating projects:

Subject to further approval and authorization by Congress (21)-----	558, 173, 300
---	---------------

Total all participating projects in S. 500, as amended-----	868, 290, 100
---	---------------

Project, previously authorized, participating in revenue (1)-----	7, 287, 000
---	-------------

Total all participating projects (34)-----	875, 577, 100
--	---------------

Grand total, all projects in S. 500, as amended-----	1, 658, 460, 100
--	------------------

9. SUMMARY, CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND ALLOCATIONS, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Project	State	Construction costs				Repayment of reimbursable costs ²	
		Total ¹	Nonreimbursable	Reimbursable allocations		By water users ³	By power
				Power	Municipal water		
Storage units:							
Authorized for construction under S. 500:							
Echo Park.....	Colorado-Utah.....	\$176,426,000		\$128,383,000			\$176,426,000
Juniper.....	Arizona-Utah.....	421,270,000		370,974,000			421,270,000
Flaming Gorge.....	Colorado.....	16,348,000		16,348,000			16,348,000
Navajo Dam.....	Utah-Wyoming.....	82,942,000		52,042,000			82,942,000
	New Mexico.....	36,592,000	\$1,298,000				35,294,000
Subtotal.....		733,578,000	1,298,000	567,747,000			732,280,000
Authorized subject to report to the Congress:							
Curceanti (940,000 acre-feet).....	Colorado.....	49,305,000		41,205,000			49,305,000
Total storage units.....		782,883,000	1,298,000	608,952,000			781,585,000
Participating projects:							
Authorized subject to supplemental reports:							
LaBarge.....	Wyoming.....	1,673,300				\$495,000	1,178,300
Seedskaeoc.....	do.....	23,272,000				4,785,000	18,487,000
Lyman.....	do.....	10,564,000				2,255,000	8,309,000
Silt.....	Colorado.....	3,356,000	73,000			1,020,000	2,262,400
Smith Fork.....	do.....	3,367,000	24,000			1,045,000	2,298,000
Paonia.....	do.....	4,694,000	152,400			2,414,000	4,377,600
Florida.....	do.....	6,941,500	437,900			1,711,500	4,792,100
Pine River project extension.....	Colorado-New Mexico.....	5,027,000				2,045,000	2,982,000
Emery County.....	Utah.....	9,865,500	229,000			3,715,000	5,921,500
Central Utah (initial phase).....	do.....	231,044,000	5,991,000	46,689,000	45,500,000	\$ 60,691,000	\$ 7158,862,000
Hammond.....	New Mexico.....	2,302,000				370,000	1,932,000
Gooseberry.....	Utah.....	5,760,500	33,000			2,375,000	3,352,500
Subtotal.....		310,116,800	6,940,900	46,689,000	45,500,000	82,921,500	7 214,754,400
Total projects authorized in S. 500, as amended.....		1,092,999,800	8,238,900	655,651,000	45,500,000	82,921,500	7 996,339,400

10. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

The comments of the Departments of the Army, Interior, and Agriculture, including endorsements by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Federal Power Commission are made a part of this report, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., February 25, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: A report has been requested from this Department on S. 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

In his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower said (H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., p. 8):

"* * * the Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Likewise in his budget message (H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., p. m65) the President said:

"I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the Upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments."

In the budget itself it was pointed out (p. 830) that the administration proposes to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project during the next fiscal year if it is authorized and that the budget includes an item for funds to be requested for this purpose.

The substance of our views on the proper contents of a bill to implement the President's recommendation and particularly on those projects and units which should be covered in the initial legislation is contained in the draft of a bill which was developed by the Bureau of the Budget in collaboration with this Department and submitted to your committee on April 1, 1954, in connection with S. 1555, 83d Congress, a predecessor of the present S. 500.

We recommend that S. 500 be examined in the light of the proposal there made and in the light of the two letters dated March 18, 1954, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to your committee and to this Department which are reprinted in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, and that, with suitable amendments, S. 500 be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., March 17, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge Mr. Stewart French's letter of January 20, 1955, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 500,

a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Enactment of legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project was recommended by the President both in his state of the Union message and his budget message this year. The views of this Bureau concerning the details of such legislation were expressed in letters of March 18, 1954, to your committee and to the Secretary of the Interior, which are printed in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, 2d session. On April 1, 1954, a draft bill, which was developed in collaboration with the Department of the Interior, was submitted to your committee.

With respect to the detailed provisions of S. 500, this Bureau has the following comments:

1. In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navajo participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

2. There would appear to be ample justification for the closest cooperation between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior concerning the agricultural aspects of the participating projects. The use of the word "consultation" on page 3, line 25, would therefore be understood to mean consultation in its broadest sense.

3. Section 7 and reference to it in section 1 (2) (a) (iii) is interpreted to mean that all costs for improvements in fish and wildlife, as well as mitigation of losses not attributable to the construction of the project, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable and shall be financed by the agencies responsible for these programs. However, the cost of preventing damages attributable to the construction of the project should be treated as a part of the cost and allocated to the various purposes in the same manner as other damages. The addition of clarifying language would avoid misinterpretations.

4. The inclusion of section 10 in our draft bill referred to above, namely, "Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country," would appear to be a desirable addition to S. 500, since this would be the principal consideration in determining rate of construction and development.

5. It is considered that the authorization should be limited to \$950 million, as proposed in the draft bill, in order to give the Congress a greater measure of control over the extent of the development and an opportunity to review the program from time to time.

6. Since we do not have detailed information concerning the city of Denver's proposed Blue River project or the effects of the provisions of section 11 of S. 500 on the interests of the Federal Government or on pending litigation, we are not in a position to comment on this section at this time, and have requested the Department of Justice to review this section.

7. The Bureau of the Budget also is not in a position to comment on section 12, until we have received the views of the Department of Justice on this section.

8. It is recommended that the title be amended to read, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Accordingly, it is recommended that S. 500 be amended as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington 25, March 25, 1955.

Re S. 500, 84th Congress, 1st session.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
 United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request there are enclosed three copies of the report of the Federal Power Commission on the bill S. 500, 84th Congress, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

We have just been advised that there is no objection by the Bureau of the Budget to the presentation of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME K. KUYKENDALL, *Chairman.*

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REPORT ON S. 500, 84TH CONGRESS

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Cross Mountain, Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works, provided that the authority to construct the Curecanti Dam shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs. The Commission believes that such conditional authorization of the Curecanti project is highly desirable, and that it would be desirable to amend the bill to likewise require conditional authorization with respect to undertaking construction of the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, and Navajo projects.

Based upon a consideration of the power features involved, it is believed that authorization of the Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir projects, as provided for in the bill, is desirable for inclusion in the initial program for future development of the Colorado River Basin. The Echo Park project is favorably located to assist in serving power loads of the northerly part of the Upper Colorado River Basin, and the Glen Canyon project is favorably located for assisting in serving power loads to the south.

Section 1 of the bill would also authorize 14 enumerated participating reclamation and power projects provided that the construction of the participating projects shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reexamined the economic justification of each project and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reimbursability requirements set forth in section 4 of the bill can be met. Such supplemental reports, except for San Juan-Chama and the Navajo projects, would not, however, be subject to section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) which provides that the Secretary of the Interior, in making investigations and reports for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall give the affected State or States opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The Commission agrees that authorization of these participating reclamation and power projects should be made conditional on the findings and recommendations of supplemental detailed reports dealing with their economic and engineering feasibility, as provided for in the bill, but it does not feel that the public interest requires or justifies the exemption of such supplemental reports from the opportunity for State cooperation afforded by section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Section 2 of the bill declares it to be the intent of Congress to authorize further units of the storage project and new participating projects upon the basis of the data which may be made available to it in the future in accordance with this bill and also in conformity with beneficial consumptive use provisions of article III

of the Upper Colorado River Basin compact. The costs of any participating projects thus authorized shall be amortized in accordance with the Federal reclamation law and this bill.

Section 4 provides that revenues in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to commercial power within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof. It also provides that revenues in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the commercial power features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. These repayment provisions correspond generally with the Commission's established practice in analyzing and evaluating Federal multiple-purpose power projects of assuming amortization of power investments in not to exceed 50 years from the in-service date, with interest, usually at the rate of 2½ percent.

Section 5 provides that upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof, the Secretary of the Interior shall allocate the total costs (excluding certain nonreimbursable costs for recreation and fish and wildlife) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. The Commission believes that the bill should provide for such cost allocations to be made in conformity with those standards and procedures which may have been established for interagency use at that time.

Section 5 also provides that the Secretary would be required to report to the Congress, on January 1 of each year beginning with the fiscal year 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report would be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment. This requirement of periodic detailed reports on the financial aspects of the proposed improvements appears to be highly desirable.

In several statutes (e. g., sec. 5, act of December 22, 1944, 58 Stat. 887, 890; act of July 31, 1950, 64 Stat. 382) Congress has provided that the rate schedules for power sales from certain Federal power projects shall be subject to approval by the Federal Power Commission. The Commission is of the opinion that similar rate control should be provided in this instance and that it should be authorized not only to approve the initial rate schedules, but should have authority to review the rates at appropriate intervals and prescribe those rates which will return to the United States the costs which are properly chargeable to power under the criteria laid down by Congress. It should be noted that the Commission is not an operating agency, but was created by Congress to act as its agent to perform functions directly related to the rate supervision here recommended.

The Commission believes that the authority to determine the portion of the investment in multiple-purpose projects allocable to electric power should rest with the agency responsible for the approval of electric power rates. In this connection, the Commission points out that it has been given authority to make cost allocations for the Bonneville and McNary projects on the Columbia River, the Fort Peck project on the Missouri river, and four proposed projects on the lower Snake River.

If the Congress should see fit to enact this legislation, it is recommended that the Commission be given jurisdiction over rates for the sale of power from the projects in the Colorado River Basin and authority to allocate the costs of such projects among the several project purposes. The Commission also recommends that authorization to undertake construction of the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, and Navajo projects be made conditional upon supplemental investigation reports by the Secretary of the Interior, and that section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944, relating to opportunity for State participation, be made applicable to supplemental reports of the Secretary on participating projects.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
By JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., March 28, 1955.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to Mr. Stewart French's letter of January 21, 1955, requesting a report by this Department on S. 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Since S. 500 relates primarily to Department of the Interior authority, this Department takes no position regarding enactment of the bill. However, in the event favorable consideration is given to such legislation, we recommend (1) that it provide for cooperation by the Secretary of Agriculture with the Secretary of the Interior in the appraisal, before authority to construct projects becomes effective, of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of each proposed project that is expected to produce such benefits; and (2) that it provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be granted the same authorities as the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of section 7 when any unit or project is within or partly within the boundary of a national forest.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain 6 specified initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works and, after reexamination of the economic justification of each such project including a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, 14 other specified participating projects. It would declare the intent of the Congress to authorize additional units of the Colorado River storage project and additional participating projects. It also would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, construct, operate, and maintain public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for Colorado River storage project units and participating projects.

In reporting to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on June 30, 1954, on S. 1555 we referred to a substitute draft bill submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on April 1, 1954. It provided for a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of the project, made by the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture. We consider that provision to more clearly express the relationship that should prevail in such a reappraisal than the provision for consultation included in S. 500.

The Department of Agriculture has a responsibility, commensurate with its national responsibilities, in the agricultural phases of the development, conservation, and utilization of land and water in the Upper Colorado River Basin which would be authorized by such bills. This includes the furnishing of reports to the President and the Congress on the agricultural aspects concurrently with reports by other agencies on other aspects of the proposed developments and the planning, operation, and maintenance of public recreational facilities on those portions of storage project units or participating projects that are within national forest boundaries.

The Bureau of the Budget advises there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Under Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington 25, D. C., April 6, 1955.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to S. 500, 84th Congress, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The Department of the Army has considered the above-mentioned bill. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the principal features of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Comments on four of the major units (Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Navajo, and Curecanti) in the comprehensive plan covered by S. 500 and on the participating projects are not practicable from an engineering and economic standpoint

without an up-to-date engineering and economic report. However, with respect to the two remaining major units (Echo Park and Glen Canyon), the Department of the Army has reviewed a report of the Department of the Interior and has advised that Department that these two storage projects appear to be justified.

Although the Department of the Army is authorized to undertake certain examinations and surveys in the Upper Colorado River Basin and has an interest in the Rio Grande Basin which is involved in the bill to the extent of the diversion contemplated in one of the participating projects, there appears to be no basic conflict between the project units proposed in the bill and any which the Department now has or might have an interest in as a result of future investigation or construction. However, because of the departmental interest in flood control and navigation, it is recommended that the bill be amended in the following manner:

(1) In section 1, page 4, lines 8-10, strike the portion beginning with the comma in line 8 and extending through the word "not" in line 10, in order that section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944, having to do with consultation with affected States and the Secretary of the Army and providing for comment by those parties, will be made applicable to supplemental reports on participating projects;

(2) In section 1, page 4, line 15, after "affected States", insert "and the Secretary of the Army";

(3) In section 3, page 6, line 12, after "Provided," insert "That allocation of costs to flood control or navigation as nonreimbursable costs shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army and any necessary investigations or studies therefor may be performed under a cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further,*".

In connection with S. 500, the attention of your committee is invited to draft legislation which was submitted by the Secretary of the Interior to the 83d Congress on April 1, 1954, and which is set forth at pages 13-16 of Senate Report 1983 on S. 1555 of the 83d Congress. The draft bill was intended to bring proposed authorizing legislation into correlation with the project report referred to above in that it would authorize only the Echo Park and Glen Canyon storage units, and, as S. 500 does, would grant provisionsl authorization only for certain of the participating projects. To the extent that the bill authorizes only these two major storage units, the Department of the Army considers the draft bill as being preferable to S. 500 and offers no objection to the authorization of the improvements proposed in the draft legislation. However, the suggestions in (1) and (3) above would apply as well to the draft bill, with the exception that the language in (3) would be inserted in the fifth line of section 3 at page 14 of the above-mentioned Senate report, and an appropriate deletion similar to (1) above would be made in the last line of section 1 at page 13 of the Senate report.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. FINUCANE,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

11. THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

For the information of the sponsors of S. 500 and for the other Members of the Senate, the text of the measure as introduced with each change shown in *italic* is set forth below. The specific amendments are numbered and each is explained individually immediately following the text of the amended bill.

(S. 500 as introduced is shown in Roman type. Amendments by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to S. 500 as introduced, are numbered and shown in *italic*.)

[S. 500, 84th Cong., 1st sess.]

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in *italic*]

A BILL To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, the

Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, **[1]** ~~making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize~~ *commencing a program for utilization in the States of the Upper Basin*, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: **[2]** ~~Cross Mountain~~, Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, **[3]** ~~Juniper~~, and Navajo: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level **[4]** ~~and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board~~, and that construction thereof, **[5]** ~~and of the Juniper unit~~, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of **[6]** ~~such~~ each unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of **[7]** ~~such~~ each unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, **[8]** ~~Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruittland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette~~: *Provided*, That **[9]** ~~(a)~~ construction of the participating projects set forth in this clause (2) shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reexamined the economic justification of such project and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reimbursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this Act can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each such project shall include, among other things, (i) a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of the project made by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the total cost of construction of each participating project or separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures authorized by section 7 of this Act, to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any other purpose authorized under reclamation law. **[10]** ~~Section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall, except as hereinafter provided for the San Juan-Chama and the Navajo participating projects, not be applicable to such supplemental reports; and, (b) that no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan-Chama project or the Navajo participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1944; and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress~~ *Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: Provided further, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruittland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of*

the San Juan-Chama and Navajo participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by Act of Congress: *Provided further*, That with reference to the San Juan-Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

[11] *SEC. 2:* In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this Act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof)—

(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, of waters of the Upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this Act and Federal reclamation law.

[12] *SEC. 2.* It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) **[13]** irrigation ~~repayment~~ contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the **[14]** irrigation obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter

referred to as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 7.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 7, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury, **[15]** *and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this Act.*

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made within fifty years after completion of that portion of the project which has not been constructed as of the date of this Act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277): *Provided*, That revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act. **[16]** *After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this Act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the Upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.*

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable features thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

(e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating project of separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 7 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year **[17]** ~~1955~~ 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project

and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants [18] and transmission lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided [19] for, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty With the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 9. Expenditures for the [20] Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, [21] Juniper, Navajo and Echo Park initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power and other property of the United States as shall be required in connection with the development or use of its Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than water rights for the necessary functions of the United States Government.

SEC. 12. [22] (a) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, [23] the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States, [24] either on its own behalf or as *parens patriae*, to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. No right to impound or use water for the generation of power or energy, created or established by the building, operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by this Act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado River [25] and its tributaries System for domestic or agricultural purposes [26] within any of the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

[27] (b) *In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programing the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of one representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and one representative of the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.*

SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin", "Colorado River Compact", "Colorado River System", "Lee Ferry", "States of the Upper Division", "Upper Basin", and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

The term "States of the Upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "Upper Basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785); and

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

12. EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

[1] Strike out "making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize", and insert in lieu thereof *commencing a program for utilization in the States of the Upper Basin,*.

[1] Clarifying amendment. This substitution of language is to make it clear that this is the commencement of a program for utilization of Colorado River waters in the States of the Upper Basin, and does not in any way bar the States of the Upper Basin from subsequent utilization of additional waters through other projects.

[2] and [3] Strike out "Cross Mountain", and insert in alphabetical order *Juniper*.

[2] and [3] Gov. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, in his testimony before the Committee, advised there would be serious flooding of irrigated areas if the Cross Mountain Dam were to be built. It was his opinion that the Juniper Dam, although a smaller project, would be more desirable and could be supplemented by other dams on the Yampa River.

[4] After the words "sea level" insert *and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board,*.

[4] Inasmuch as the Colorado Water Conservation Board is the official water agency of the State, this amendment was recommended.

[5] After the word "thereof," insert *and of the Juniper unit,*.

[5] A detailed feasibility report has not yet been completed by the Interior Department on this unit. The above amendment requires the Secretary to certify to the Congress that the project meets

feasibility requirements from engineering and economic standpoints before its construction can be started.

[6] and [7] Strike out "such" and insert *each*.

[6] and [7] Perfecting amendment necessary by the addition of the Juniper unit.

[8] After the word "Navajo" insert *Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette*.

[8] These participating projects as listed are in the form recommended by the Upper Colorado River Commission and agreed to by all the States participating as members of the commission.

[9] Strike out "(a)".

[9] Perfecting amendment.

[10] Beginning with the word "Section" in line 14, page 4, strike out all of lines 15 to 24, inclusive, and the words "approved and authorized by the Congress" in line 1, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: Provided further, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navajo participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by Act of Congress:

[10] The language was stricken because of the inclusion of the additional projects listed in amendment No. 8. At the top of page 5 the new language inserted beginning on line 1 reads as follows:

Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports:

That part of the new language refers to the requirements of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which requires that project plans be submitted to the States affected before submittal by the Interior Department to the Congress.

The preceding language to which this exception refers provides for supplemental reports by the Secretary evaluating the direct and indirect benefits of the participating projects named in the bill. Each of the participating projects which are named on page 3, with the exception of the additional ones listed beginning on line 4 of page 5, have already been submitted to the States in the form of project reports presenting an evaluation of benefits.

The language dealing with the requirement for supplemental reports was inserted to make doubly sure, under the circumstances involved in the upper basin, that the first evaluation of direct benefits was

accurate before Federal funds are actually expended in the construction of the projects.

The language beginning on line 4, page 5, requires that reports on those participating projects listed beginning at that point must be submitted to the States in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944 since no feasibility reports on the projects in this category have been reviewed by the States of the Colorado River Basin.

Beginning on line 13, page 5, there is a specific provision requiring that the reports on San Juan-Chama and Navajo participating projects be submitted to the State of Texas. This requirement recognizes the interest of the State of Texas in the waters of the Rio Grande Basin, including those exported from the Colorado River Basin into the Rio Grande Basin. Because of the interest of Texas over the years in this question, the amendment affords Texas an opportunity to review the project plans of the San Juan-Chama and Navajo which have not been submitted to any of the affected States either in the Rio Grande Basin or in the Colorado River Basin.

[11] and **[12]** Strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

[11] and **[12]** The new language in section 2 deals with future developments in the Upper Colorado River Basin. It sets forth that it is not the intention of the Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact of 1922, and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact of 1948, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects within the allocation made in the Colorado River Compact of 1922 as additional needs are indicated.

[13] On page 7, line 24, after "(a)" strike out "irrigation repayment".

[14] On page 8, line 2, after the words "repayment of the", insert *irrigation*.

[13] and **[14]** Perfecting amendments.

[15] After "Treasury," insert *and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this Act.*

[15] Perfecting amendment to make clear intent that construction funds appropriated by Congress may be expended after crediting to the basin fund.

[16] After "Act" insert:

After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this Act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the Upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

[16] This amendment is to clarify the intent of Congress that net project revenues will be available for additional projects consistent with comprehensive upper basin development and within compact apportionments, after repayment of all obligations pursuant to this act, subject to future authorization by Congress. This is not an exclusive earmarking of these funds, however, and is designed only to establish conclusively that this bill is not intended to preclude future development in the upper basin from project revenues as may be authorized by Congress.

[17] Strike out "1955" and insert in lieu thereof 1956,.

[17] Perfecting amendment.

[18] After "powerplants" insert *and transmission lines*.

[18] Perfecting amendment. Inadvertently omitted.

[19] After the word "provided" insert the word *for*.

[19] Perfecting amendment.

[20] and [21] Strike out "Cross Mountain" and insert after "Glen Canyon" the word *Juniper*,.

[20] and [21] This change was made to conform to amendments (2) and (3).

[22] After "SEC. 12." insert (a).

[22] Perfecting amendment.

[23] After "Colorado River Compact," insert *the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact*,.

[23] Perfecting amendment.

[24] After "United States," insert *either on its own behalf or as parens patriae*,.

[24] The words, *either on its own behalf or as parens patriae* are added to waive the sovereign immunity of the United States to actions brought by basin States in the Supreme Court of the United States under the judicial doctrine of *parens patriae* on behalf of one of their cities or other political subdivisions to enforce the requirements of section 12. The Committee recognizes that the Congress cannot restrict or enlarge the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court under Article III of the Constitution.

[25] After "Colorado River" strike out "and its tributaries" and insert *System*.

[25] Perfecting amendment in order to conform to other necessary legislation.

[26] After the word "purposes" insert a period and strike out "within any of the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin."

[26] This was stricken to protect power generation against other uses.

[27] Insert a new subsection under Section 12 as follows:

(b) *In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programing the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of one representa-*

tive appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and one representative of the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

[27] Provides for appointment of an Advisory Committee representing the States concerned and for consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

RUSSELL B. LONG.

HENRY M. JACKSON.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

W. KERR SCOTT.

ALAN BIBLE.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

(with reservations expressed in
Separate Views).

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

FRANK A. BARRETT.

BARRY GOLDWATER.

II

SEPARATE VIEWS

OF

SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON, ON S. 500,
THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

I concur with the majority of the committee in the recommendation that the Upper Colorado project be authorized for construction by the Federal Government, but I oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam on the Green River. I hope that the Senate will delay authorization of this phase of the project until adequate consideration has been given to alternative undertakings which will produce equivalent multipurpose benefits without encroaching on the scenic grandeur of a national park or monument.

ECHO PARK DAM A THREAT TO NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

The Echo Park Dam site is within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. In my opinion, construction of this dam would constitute a serious threat to the future integrity of our great national park system. It would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our natural recreational reserves for economic purposes. If the pressure for such encroachments is to be resisted, the task, under the present administration, falls upon the Congress to resist it.

Our national park system represents one of the most valuable natural properties which we possess. It contributes today to the physical, inspirational, and educational well-being of our people, nearly 50 million of whom visited the system last year. As our population expands, and the tensions of urban culture and industrialized civilization increase, we shall need more sanctuaries where our people can relax the tightened nerves that come with modern living. Only in our national park system and a few other areas have we preserved a remnant of the natural treasury that once covered this continent, and only here will our children be able to know America as our forefathers knew it.

The lands reserved in our national parks and monuments are dedicated to their wisest use, and their essential contributions are directly dependent on strict preservation of their natural conditions without distortion by human activity. Their benefits cannot be measured solely in dollar return, but they are the keystone of the vast tourist industry.

PROTECTION OF PARKS AND MONUMENTS IS TRADITIONAL

Ever since the National Park Service was established in 1916, Congress has consistently refused to enact legislation which would violate the protection given our national parks and monuments, in spite of constant pressures to do so. Construction of Echo Park Dam not only would set a ruinous precedent, but it would specifically

destroy the features and qualities that led to reservation from commercial use of the great canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

The beauty of the Dinosaur National Monument has been left in its undisturbed natural condition. The majesty of the canyon walls, the intricate pattern of eroded cliffs, their colors and shadows, present an unparalleled example of our Nation's original tranquil wilderness. This section of the Green and Yampa Rivers has some of the most beautiful scenery in the world.

We are promised the expenditure of millions of dollars to make a more accessible recreational area of the reservoir which will fill the precipitous gorges of the Green and Yampa Rivers. Yet to those who love the silent, pristine isolation of our primitive wilderness, this is little comfort. The wisest use of Dinosaur National Monument is to preserve inviolate for the future its wild beauty, a value worthy of as much consideration as the purely utilitarian objectives of S. 500.

In spite of the mass of testimony about Echo Park Dam, no concrete evidence has been presented that Echo Park Dam is necessary. Asserted justifications for it have changed repeatedly, as one or another contention has been found to be invalid. It is difficult to understand why the sponsors of the Colorado storage project are so insistent that Echo Park Dam be built here and now, rather than defer recommendation for authorization while thorough studies are made of the possibility of revising the project to secure the desired benefits without the damage this dam would do. The House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation has requested further information from the Bureau of Reclamation about feasible alternative methods of constructing the project, and this information should be made available to the Senate before final consideration is given this legislation.

In the absence of undeniable proof that Echo Park Dam is necessary to the welfare of the Nation as a whole, this feature of the project should be deleted from the present authorization.

The question is not a choice between preserving a national monument or securing water benefits. Rather, it is how to adjust the present plans to utilize the water and secure the desired power in such a way as to reaffirm the primary values embodied by our national park system.

ECHO PARK COULD SET A PERILOUS PRECEDENT

Once the inviolability of that system is ignored in the Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Certain lumber operators hope to harvest the fir and spruce rain forests of the Olympic National Park. Irrigationists have hungrily eyed the waters of the Yellowstone. Some groups would like to construct a dam across a river within Glacier National Park.

To the values of conservation, it makes little difference whether the encroachment is by public or private enterprise. Once the traditional policies of the National Park Service are sacrificed at Echo Park, a coordinated onslaught by private interests against the boundaries of national parks and national monuments will begin all over the land.

If the reclamation service can cross the frontier of Dinosaur National Monument, why should not timber operators in the Olympics insist that a similar privilege be accorded them? What about sheep and stock ranchers eyeing the lush meadows of the Yellowstone or

the rangelands of Grand Canyon National Park? Will there be pressure to cut the pine forests of Crater Lake National Park in Oregon? Echo Park is the test. If the beauties of Dinosaur National Monument can be sacrificed for Echo Park Dam, then other national monuments and national parks are in danger of commercial exploitation justified by reasons which will be made to sound equally compelling.

An attempt has been made by supporters of Echo Park Dam to belittle the opposition to the project by people who place the contemplation and enjoyment of unspoiled natural grandeur above values which can be measured in dollars and cents. Yet, many illustrious Americans have shared their preference, and it is wrong to minimize the extent of the popular rallying in defense of Dinosaur National Monument, which extends across the length and breadth of our country.

AMERICAN CONSERVATION GROUPS QUESTION WISDOM OF ECHO PARK

Let me refer only to the statement of policy, appearing on page 689 of the committee's hearings on S. 500, which was adopted by representatives of more than 20 conservation organizations, called into emergency meeting in November of 1954 by the National Parks Association:

1. The national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being enjoyed and supported by millions of people. The conservationists represent the public interest in the preservation of these areas. That is what brings us together in this crisis.

2. We are opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would flood any portion of any national park or monument.

3. We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound Upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system. We point out that the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been demonstrated. It has only been asserted. We also point out that the alternatives to Echo Park Dam have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proved inferior.

4. We invite all citizens to join with us to make sure that areas set aside for preservation in the national park system are not needlessly invaded or destroyed.

(Signed) The American Museum of Natural History.
 The American Nature Association.
 The American Planning and Civic Association.
 The Conservation Department, Yale University.
 The Conservation Foundation.
 The Council of Conservationists.
 The Dartmouth Outdoor Club.
 The Emergency Conservation Committee.
 The Garden Club of America.
 The General Federation of Women's Clubs.
 The Izaak Walton League of America.
 The National Audubon Society.
 The National Conference on State Parks.
 The National Council of State Garden Clubs.
 The National Life Conservation Society.
 The National Parks Association.
 The National Wildlife Federation.
 The North American Wildlife Foundation.
 The Outdoor Writers Association of America.
 The Sierra Club.
 The Wilderness Society.
 The Wildlife Management Institute.

The inundation of part of the Dinosaur National Monument by the proposed Echo Park Dam is opposed, in summary, by virtually all the organizations which traditionally have fought to protect what remains of our original scenery and outdoor grandeur. Yet I call to the attention of the Senate the constructive and openminded nature of this statement. It does not attempt to discredit the entire Upper Colorado project, opposed though these conservation groups may be to one phase of the project. It simply suggests that the project be undertaken without that single feature which would imperil national park standards.

ONLY ECHO PARK PHASE OF PROJECT IS OPPOSED

Because I share this view, I have joined the majority of the committee in voting to report S. 500 out for consideration by the Senate. Although I oppose the Echo Park phase of the project, I do not agree with those few conservation groups, such as the California Academy of Sciences, which launched an all-out attack against the entire project. I regard this as shortsighted and not within the general purview of our conservation organizations. The inclusion of Echo Park Dam does not condemn the entire Upper Colorado project. It merely means that Echo Park Dam should be eliminated because of its location within a national monument.

The present national administration has endorsed the Upper Colorado project. Many of the administration's political backers in the Congress have sought to carry out this endorsement through the enactment of the present bill.

Yet this same administration opposes the Hells Canyon project in the Pacific Northwest on the grounds that Hells Canyon would be a drain on the Federal Treasury.

In the Upper Colorado River Basin the administration proposed full Federal financing of the multipurpose projects, but in the Columbia River Basin its spokesmen advocate "partnership" with the profit-making power facilities going to the electric utility partner. The incongruities and inconsistencies in this approach to development of water resources are obvious.

UPPER COLORADO A HIGH-COST PROJECT

■ The energy to be developed at the sites in the Columbia River Basin such as Hells Canyon will be marketed for approximately 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. For this low-cost energy there is certain to be vast demand—for manufacturing, for business payrolls, for farms, for homes.

The cost of Upper Colorado power, delivered at load centers, will be approximately 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, substantially more than twice the cost of current from the Federal sites in the Columbia Basin. Demand for Upper Colorado energy, particularly for industry, will be far less than in the Pacific Northwest. Few industries would seek Upper Colorado energy at 6 mills when Columbia Basin kilowatts can be purchased for 2.5 mills. Other factors being equal, the competitive factor alone rules out the use of Upper Colorado energy for any manufactured product which could be made more cheaply elsewhere in the country.

I am not opposing the Upper Colorado project as a government undertaking. I merely am posing what to me seems an obvious question: Is it not curious that this national administration, supposedly dedicated to financial integrity, favors the Upper Colorado project and yet, in the same breath, opposes Federal development of the power sites in the Columbia Basin which are economically far more feasible?

This administration would reserve the 6-mill waterpower locations as government projects, but it willingly abandons the 2.5-mill choice power sites to the electric utilities.

WHY "YES" ON UPPER COLORADO BUT "NO" ON THE COLUMBIA?

Is an administration responsive to the public welfare when it saves for government the marginal aspect of any resource and abandons the choice features to private corporations?

It is not my purpose to indict or embarrass the Upper Colorado project. Its \$1,659 million total cost probably can be justified on the grounds that underdeveloped areas of our vast country long have needed capital improvements. The economy of the intermountain region will gain by having its agricultural economy strengthened and its energy resources increased. Echo Park is not justified, because it threatens our national park system, but I refuse to join with those who use that argument to condemn the remainder of the Upper Colorado River project.

The balance between commercial development and resource conservation must be carefully maintained in this country. Too great an emphasis in either direction can lead to serious consequences.

EX-SECRETARY OSCAR CHAPMAN WITHDREW ECHO PARK ENDORSEMENT

During preliminary discussion of the Upper Colorado project on the floor of Congress, an effort has been made to convince the public that former Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, a prominent and leading conservationist, favored construction of a dam within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, at Echo Park.

In this connection, I call attention to a letter from ex-Secretary Chapman to the President of the United States, written on December 4, 1952, shortly before both Mr. Chapman and President Truman were succeeded in office, respectively, by Douglas McKay and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. Chapman modified previous recommendations regarding the Upper Colorado project, to bring about—

deletion of the recommendation for immediate authorization of the Echo Park unit and the deletion of the recommendation for inclusion of the Split Mountain unit in the plan of development for later authorization.

Both Echo Park and Split Mountain would create reservoirs within the Dinosaur borders.

In this letter, Secretary Chapman made it explicit that alternative sites should be studied and decided upon. Portions of Mr. Chapman's letter of December 4, 1952, make clear his belief further study was needed. The letter said, in part:

Attached for your consideration is my report on a proposed plan for the development and utilization of a portion of the water resources of the Upper Colorado

River Basin by construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

* * * * *

Proposals are made in the report for authorization of a series of dams and reservoirs in the Upper Colorado River Basin for river regulation and the generation of hydroelectric power and for authorization or reauthorization of a number of related irrigation projects. Construction of the storage project would aid the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin to achieve the benefits contemplated under the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, to which the consent of the Congress was given by the act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31). The report also proposes the establishment of an Upper Colorado River Account. This would furnish a basis for uniform power rates and would aid in accounting for the return of the reimbursable costs of the participating irrigation projects.

This report as approved by me on January 25, 1951, as my proposed report for transmittal to the interested States and Federal agencies for comment, included a recommendation for authorization of the Echo Park unit and a proposal for the inclusion of the Split Mountain unit in the recommended plan of development for later authorization. Both of these units would encroach on the Dinosaur National Monument.

I am acutely aware of the controversy surrounding the issue between those who favor full development of the water and power resources of the Colorado River and those who oppose reservoir encroachments on the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers within the Dinosaur National Monument. It must be recognized that there exists no adequate measure by which the merits of the opposing views in this controversy may be gaged. Among other things, exceptionally important intangible values must be weighed against very real economic needs and potentials. The formulation of my recommendation required very careful consideration of the following points:

1. Need for a reservoir development at Echo Park versus the national value of the monument.
2. Effect of Echo Park Reservoir upon the monument.
3. Presidential order of 1938 enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument and its legal and implied interpretations.
4. Possible alternative reservoirs and their relationship to river basin development.

I have now concluded that the terms of the recommendations of the report should be modified in respect to these two units. Accordingly, the report as modified by the letter of June 29, 1951, of the Commissioner of Reclamation is further modified by the deletion of the recommendation for immediate authorization of the Echo Park unit and the deletion of the recommendation for inclusion of the Split Mountain unit in the plan of development for later authorization. In lieu of the recommendation of the Echo Park unit, I recommend that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to construct and operate facilities, at Echo Park or at an alternate site, to serve the purposes intended to be served by the Echo Park unit. This authorization should be made subject to the requirement that the Secretary give further consideration to studies of alternate sites and subject also to a finding by the Secretary, prior to the submission of requests for appropriations to initiate construction, as to the site best adapted for development in the light of all factors involved.

* * * * *

As so further modified, the report as modified by the Commissioner's letter of June 29, 1951, is adopted and approved as my report.

ECHO PARK ONLY ONE OUT OF 39 SEPARATE UNITS

The Upper Colorado project consists of many individual units. The total number, in fact, is 6 storage projects, 12 participating projects, and 21 which are subject to further authorization.

Echo Park is merely one of these separate undertakings. In my opinion, it should be eliminated—certainly for the time being. If the population of the intermountain region ever is so large that needed hydroelectric power can be obtained only at Echo Park, then the time may be at hand when the scenic values of a national monument must be sacrificed to make way for an expanding civilization. Of

course, we must always weigh the quantity of added power against the conservation values destroyed or lost.

This rule should govern all regional development, everywhere in the West. Nor should it apply exclusively to dams. Certain lumber interests, for example, would like to bring about the breaching of the national park system on the Olympic Peninsula so these mills can cut trees within the borders of the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington.

America someday may be at the stage when these trees, magnificent though they are, are imperative to national survival or to the basic comforts of America's people. If that hour is reached, then the rain forests of the Olympics may have to succumb to ax and saw. But, so long as other sources of commercial timber remain, I believe it would be little short of criminal to log and harvest one of the last remaining museums of the original coastal evergreens which once flourished in such abundance along the Pacific slope.

In essence, such a philosophy was substantiated as recently as the 83d Congress, when the Atomic Energy Act was amended to prohibit prospecting or mining of fissionable material in national parks or monuments, except when the President, by Executive order, declares that the requirements of national defense make such action necessary. Certainly if the Congress believes the boundaries of national parks must be defended from invasion even during the present search for such a vital defense product as fissionable material for atomic energy, then it cannot in good conscience endorse partial flooding of the Dinosaur National Monument for electric energy, especially when such action is not required for the defense and security of the country.

WILL THERE BE A STEADY MARKET FOR 6-MILL POWER?

Indeed, there probably is available in the Upper Colorado region a great deal more potential energy than can be used in the foreseeable future, particularly at the delivered rate of 6 mills a kilowatt-hour—a rate which precludes extensive use for competitive manufacturing. Why, then, sacrifice the most scenic parts of a national monument to build Echo Park, thus jeopardizing conservation principles which have grown up with our national park system? This is not necessary today. It may not be necessary tomorrow, or for many tomorrows.

The last projects to be undertaken for commercial development—whether by the Government or by private enterprise—should be those which imperil conservation values.

The power and storage at Echo Park are not essential to the prosperity of the intermountain West, today. Why not preserve a national monument as long as no compelling or immediate reasons dictate a different course? Urgency is not presently a prevailing factor.

I believe Echo Park Dam, inside the Dinosaur National Monument, should be eliminated from the general authorization for the Upper Colorado project until adequate consideration has been given to alternative dam sites which will produce equivalent multipurpose benefits without invading a national park or monument.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator from Oregon.

III
MINORITY VIEWS
OF

SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA, ON S. 500,
THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

After painstaking study of the bill and close analysis of the testimony, I believe that S. 500 is an unsound measure and I am forced to recommend its rejection.

The bill, which is put forward in an earnest attempt to promote the development of natural resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, is based on interpretations of the Colorado River Compact and related documents making up the law of the river which are, at the very least, strained. Certainly, they are challenged and contested. Furthermore, enactment at this time would be premature in view of the absence of much essential data about the cost, operation, and effect of the numerous projects embodied in an open-ended program that undeniably will require an outlay of billions of dollars from the Federal Treasury.

I cannot believe that the Senate will consider it wise action to approve legislation of such proportions which raises so many complex questions of policy, establishes precedents which radically depart from tested principles of natural resources development, and is characterized by grave uncertainty about eventual results.

The impact of this legislation on the future growth and progress of the western part of our Nation might well amount to revolutionary changes in interstate relations, nullification of solemn pacts between various units of government, destruction of the foundations of agricultural and industrial economy over a wide area, and jeopardizing of the welfare of tremendous numbers of people.

Sound and orderly utilization of all resources of the Colorado River system and basin is essential to the expanding prosperity of a vast section of our Nation. Assuredly, it would benefit the entire country. However, S. 500 is an ill-advised and hazardous way to try to reach this commendable goal.

Extended hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in both the 83d Congress and the 84th Congress unmistakably demonstrated that there are widely differing schools of thought about the most efficient and productive courses to bring about maximum development of natural resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin. It would be foolhardy to sidestep these differences of opinion by enacting a statute which employs a flexible yardstick for measuring economic and financial feasibility, which virtually writes a blank check on the United States Treasury, which delegates to administrative agencies authority and responsibility clearly imposed upon the Con-

gress, and which brushes aside grave issues involved in complex litigation currently pending in the highest court of this Nation.

The proposed program of development in S. 500 goes far beyond the recommendations of the President of the United States. Nevertheless, this costly and difficult undertaking is advanced with only a fragment of the extensive engineering, financial, economic, agricultural, and other data which should receive the most thorough analysis and examination before the Congress approves investment of immense sums of taxpayers' money on projects of the character envisioned.

As presented to the Senate, S. 500 contemplates an intricate network of dams, powerplants, and irrigation-reclamation works the ultimate cost of which cannot be conjectured. Specifically, the measure would authorize 6 major storage projects and 33 participating projects for the impounding, diversion, and delivery of water, and for the generation of hydroelectric power. Only the scantiest preliminary estimates are available about the cost of many of these works. The bill contains no definite limit on the amounts of public funds which may be expended for this ambitious plan. The minimum outlay admittedly would exceed \$1.5 billion, while the aggregate charges for interest on the capital expenditure would be more than double this prodigious figure.

Virtually all of the objections raised in the 83d Congress against the predecessor to S. 500 apply with undiminished force. Many additional challenges have been presented in the present Congress which merit the most serious deliberation by the Senate before a decision is reached upon this proposal.

The principal arguments which I feel compelled to present to the Senate may be summarized generally in three categories. These are: legal, economic, and policy questions.

GRAVE LEGAL QUESTIONS

The proposed projects and the contemplated basis of operating them bring squarely before the Congress sharp conflicts about interpretations of the Colorado River Compact and the law of the river. Assumptions underlying the legislation would constitute encroachment upon and veritably rewrite the basic seven-State agreement negotiated in 1922 to make possible development of this great stream, its tributaries, and the vast, varied territory embraced in its watershed.

Pending before the Supreme Court of the United States is the case of *Arizona v. California* (No. 10 Original, October Term 1953) which presents no less than eight fundamental and sharply contested issues which cannot be ignored in the consideration of any legislation dealing with further development of the Colorado River system.

In the 83d Congress, attention was drawn to the direct implications of this lawsuit. Recently, the Supreme Court has referred to its special master the question of whether to include the States of the Upper Basin as essential and affected parties. It is impossible to forecast the effect this litigation may have on the rights of those States. The final decisions which will be forthcoming in the case may well exercise a profound influence on plans for additional works and compel fundamental changes in suggested undertakings designed to benefit New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

All parties concerned about Upper Basin development concur that the practicality and feasibility of the Colorado River storage project turn directly upon the availability of water in the system to generate the hydroelectric power contemplated and to supply the agricultural and domestic needs which would be served by the projects to be authorized.

A vital question presented in *Arizona v. California* is the method of measurement of consumptive use. Availability and use of water are interwoven questions which cannot be separated.

The controversy over this point has gained steadily in importance with mounting indications the Colorado River system in actuality contains only about three-quarters of the volume of water that framers of the seven-State compact believed it contained and could be employed and enjoyed. The intention and meaning of several related portions of the compact dealing with diversion, distribution, and utilization of water are the heart of the litigation now before the Supreme Court.

In view of decided differences of thought about measurement of "beneficial consumptive use," grave and far-reaching uncertainty now exists about the effect of almost all of article III of the compact. This article is the very foundation upon which rest all present and proposed works to realize the potential benefits of the entire Colorado River system.

These doubts embrace language of the compact which (1) apportioned in perpetuity the right to utilize 7.5 million acre-feet per annum in each basin; (2) which permitted use of 1 million acre-feet annually of so-called surplus water in the lower basin; (3) which specified the manner of providing water for Mexico now required by the Mexican Water Treaty ratified over the stern protests of California 10 years ago; (4) which is a promise by Upper Basin States they will not diminish the flow at Lee Ferry below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet in any 10-year period; and (5) which stipulates the Upper Division will not withhold and the Lower Division will not compel delivery of water which could not reasonably be put to domestic and agricultural use.

The significance of the dispute about interpretations of various features of article III has been demonstrated by doubts expressed about the meaning and obligations of the compact by a respected former colleague, Gov. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado. While eager to obtain congressional approval for ambitious plans for development of the Upper Basin, Governor Johnson candidly testified before the committee that he is gravely apprehensive concerning provisions of article III (d) and III (e) relating to the guaranteed flow to the Lower Basin and possible withholding by the Upper Basin.

Former Senator Johnson last December publicly asked a series of questions stemming from his uncertainty about the intent and effect of specific provisions of the compact. During his appearance before the committee more than 2 months later, he still was not satisfied the Upper Colorado Basin States could withhold the water which is proposed in this bill.

I call attention to page 237 of the transcript of committee hearings, where the following discussion is reported:

Senator KUCHEL. Yes; I was quoting the Governor's words there in that last paragraph.

Then on page 12, Governor, again your own language:

"I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the Upper Basin and must be delivered to the Lower Basin to satisfy the award of 1.5 million acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the Lower Basin.

"Furthermore, should the Lower Basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released."

On the basis of that comment, Governor, I first ask if those views of yours are the same today as when you gave them to the press in December of last year.

Governor JOHNSON. Those views are all in the nature of a question and I have had not the answer to that question. So the question is still bothering me.

This whole document is in the nature of a question and I am anxious to know the answer. I understand that the members of this committee do not feel that the questions have the merit which I gave them, but, nevertheless, I am still seeking answers to this whole document.

In the event the final decision of the Supreme Court in *Arizona v. California* sustains interpretations of the compact as are contended by California, the fears voiced by Governor Johnson will have been justified. A ruling in consonance with California's position will mean that availability of water for two key features of the project—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams—will be reduced to the point where the entire basis for the Upper Basin storage project will have been eliminated.

Another feature of the compact is involved in the pending lawsuit in a fashion which throws further doubt on the availability of water to generate the power to provide revenues to make the entire project feasible and to supply the more than 1.1 million acres intended to be furnished with new or supplemental quantities. The Supreme Court has been asked to rule on the meaning and effect of article VII which relates to rights of Indian tribes in the basin.

In the pending controversy, the Department of Justice has made claims which seem to involve over 1.7 million acre-feet of water of the system and seriously reduce the allocations of 7.5 million acre-feet to each basin. During the 1954 hearings, Judge Jean S. Breitenstein, who for years was attorney for the Colorado Water Conservation Board, acknowledged the ultimate scope of the question about Indian rights is itself disputed. Judge Breitenstein conceded that if the Supreme Court upholds a theory that Indian claims constitute a first demand upon the water—

then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

The committee was unable to obtain a clear statement of the attitude which the United States takes in regard to quantities of water to which the Indian tribes may eventually be entitled. Officials of the Department of the Interior, while maintaining the Indian rights issue is immaterial to S. 500, could not state what priorities are claimed on behalf of the tribes resident in the basin. The question is, at the very least, confused and clouded since the compact declares nothing in the way of allocations to individual States shall impair obligations of the United States to Indian tribes.

In the present situation, the Department of Justice asserts superior rights for Indian tribes, yet the Department of the Interior cannot testify concerning the amounts of water which are involved. Apparently the issue is so debatable there is difference of opinion within

the Interior Department and reluctance on the part of that agency to agree with the Justice Department contention.

The broad question of measurement of water has an undeniable impact on the distant future welfare of the entire Lower Basin, just as it does on possible development of the Upper Basin. The aggregate capacity of the storage reservoirs proposed in S. 500 is more than 40 million acre-feet. The average flow of the stream at Lee Ferry, according to studies over 40 years, is 15.4 million acre-feet annually. On this basis, in the opinion of experts, an estimated 20 years would be required to fill the reservoirs and make possible the generation of the hydroelectric power which is essential to provide revenues by which the entire project would be feasible. If the Supreme Court finds the water may not be withheld, the financial foundation of the whole project crumbles.

My colleagues of the majority of the committee are disposed to minimize the relationship between *Arizona v. California* and this legislation. They contend that the issues involved in the litigation are inconsequential except as they will determine disposition of Lower Basin problems. I cannot agree.

The whole concept of the Upper Colorado River storage project is based on interpretations of the law of the river by proponents of the legislation and by the Department of the Interior which would administer it. I submit that operation of the Upper Basin development plan would be directly influenced by findings of the Supreme Court on such points as the meaning of "per annum" in article III (a) relative to apportionment of water between the two basins, the extent of "rights which may now exist," the availability of III (b) water in the Lower Basin, the means of carrying the Mexican treaty burden, the status of Indian claims, and the respective rights of Upper and Lower Basins to withhold or require delivery of water.

Prudence and conscientiousness seemingly would dictate the obtaining of final answers to the many far-reaching questions before the United States proceeds to expend upwards of \$1.5 billion and assume a burden that eventually could reach \$4 billion for a network of projects whose feasibility is so largely contingent upon revenues from key powerplants. Only after the questions in the suit are settled, and not while they remain unanswered, would enactment of a measure authorizing future expensive works on the Colorado River be warranted and sensible procedure.

SERIOUS FISCAL PROBLEMS

The financial and economic problems involved in this legislation are equally important and complex.

This program is described as in accord with recommendations of the President. However, in its present form, S. 500 goes far beyond the program submitted to the Congress by the Department of the Interior which President Eisenhower termed "well-conceived."

The development plan as outlined by the administration consisted of 2 major storage dams—Echo Park and Glen Canyon—and 11 new participating irrigation and reclamation projects. The Interior Department did not recommend the bill before us, has reservations about the benefits and feasibility of certain of the works sought to be undertaken, and can supply only rough estimates of cost and repayment in

reports on reconnaissance investigations into 15 of the participating projects enumerated in S. 500 as it emerged from our committee.

The Department proposed the construction of works which would create reservoirs with storage capacity of 32,460,000 acre-feet, costing \$597,696,000, together with 11 new participating projects, costing \$304,356,000, to provide new and supplemental water supplies for 366,290 acres.

The works proposed by S. 500 comprise 6 storage dams, capable of storing 40,390,000 acre-feet of water and costing \$821,886,000 plus 33 participating projects, calling for an investment of \$874,281,800 to supply 1,208,645 acres with new and supplemental water.

Thus, the development envisioned by S. 500 would require expenditures nearly twice the total deemed feasible by the Interior Department, impounding more than 21 percent more water, and supplying over three times as many acres of land.

The ultimate aggregate cost of this legislation cannot be even guessed, inasmuch as only preliminary and partial studies have been made of 17 of the 33 participating projects. The interest charge which eventually will be paid by the Nation's taxpayers obviously will amount to several billions of dollars, since the Interior Department has advised the comparable burden imposed by those works it originally recommended will amount to a total of \$1,153 million in the year 2032.

The fundamental economics of the entire program are subject to challenge and depart from precedent. Although this venture would be built under the reclamation laws, its success from a financial viewpoint will be determined by the sale of power proposed to be produced at the six main reservoirs.

Of the aggregate \$1,696,147,800 construction cost of the 33 participating projects and 6 storage dams, the agricultural water users would repay only \$108,212,200, according to Reclamation Bureau estimates. The taxpayers' prospects of getting back investment costs rest on the soundness of predictions about the market for power and the willingness of consumers to pay prices for hydroelectricity which are substantially above the level established at comparable other developments constructed by the Interior Department.

The statistics furnished the committee by the Bureau of Reclamation show the estimated income over the payout period from sales of power from the six major storage works would be \$909,152,300. The revenue is based on an assumption of a ready market for energy at the high price of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. As indicated in the portion of this report dealing with legal issues, the availability of water to generate this electricity is by no means certain.

The idea of justifying such an ambitious undertaking by forecasting prospective power revenues is in itself extraordinary in view of the conditions surrounding this program. In the case of the first venture on the Colorado River, Hoover Dam, firm contracts for power sales were consummated in advance of construction. In the instant case, the extent of the market in many areas has been merely estimated in reconnaissance studies while the population is widely distributed with an average density of only 3 persons per square mile compared to the national average of approximately 51. The committee received only general assurances that, subject to conditions which have not been

worked out, private utilities stand ready to purchase "large blocks" of energy.

To illustrate the premature nature of this bill, the committee was unable to get any estimate of revenues from the proposed Juniper Dam and powerplant, although engineering plans call for generating and transmission features costing \$5,834,000. Initial energy output was estimated at 125 million kilowatt-hours.

The basis on which the Congress and the Federal Government have undertaken a variety of public works in the past has included consideration of what is known as a cost-benefit ratio. In one form or another, such a figure is applied against proposed river and harbor improvements, flood prevention works, and all irrigation-reclamation developments. This program embraces a number of projects with widely varying cost-benefit ratios.

Disregarding the actual value of lands to be served and such questions as the type of crops to be raised, the evidence before the committee about the project costs is such that Congress should weigh carefully the lengths to which the United States goes in underwriting such developments.

Let me make this clear. I do not condemn so-called high-cost projects per se and I acknowledge that this Nation has virtually constructed all of the low-cost developments which appear feasible.

Nevertheless, I am disturbed at the variations from \$210 to \$749 per acre for construction costs of the initial projects and from \$77 to \$1,530 per acre for the participating projects added by the committee. As I have noted in other connections, the estimates for many of these latter projects are extremely preliminary, coming from what are termed by the Reclamation Bureau "reconnaissance reports."

Besides relying on power revenues to substantiate arguments that the entire development is "feasible," proponents of S. 500 have endorsed a remarkable and novel repayment plan. The reimbursements would be greatly delayed, with much of the repayment not scheduled to begin until 50 years after completion of construction. A substantial amount of the outlay is assigned arbitrarily to irrigation features, thus reducing the interest charge against the program and transferring an additional load to all of the Nation's taxpayers.

The allocation of construction costs to irrigation is exceedingly difficult to accept in the case of the main storage dams. Little water for agricultural use would be withdrawn from the reservoirs behind these structures, yet a high percentage of the investment would be charged against irrigation and reclamation. This is especially true in the case of the two biggest units, Echo Park and Glen Canyon. The Reclamation Bureau assigns \$48,043,000 of \$176,426,000 and \$50,296,000 of \$421,270,000, respectively, to irrigation and reclamation, but not a dollar of repayment of the costs would be received from water users.

Another reason for the utmost caution is the possible effect of Upper Basin development on the financial structure of Lower Basin developments. Revenues from Hoover Dam would be jeopardized if, because of dry cycles or other factors, water should not be available for the downstream powerplant. The committee, in other hearings on a related matter concerning the Colorado River, recently was advised that the hydroelectric output in the Lower Basin had been curtailed because of inadequate water.

The optimism of proponents of the Upper Basin program was questioned by an expert consultant for one of the States which expects to benefit. Raymond A. Hill, consulting engineer retained by Colorado, declared that even if the Upper Colorado River storage project, on the modest scale proposed by the Interior Department, had been built a quarter-century ago and put in operation as soon as the seven-State compact was consummated—

there would not have been enough water since then for the beneficial consumptive uses in the Upper Basin permitted by that compact.

CONSIDERATIONS OF POLICY

The foregoing discussion implies some of the broad policy matters that are inherent in legislation of the sort of S. 500. I believe that it is unwise to make decisions on fundamental principles in piecemeal fashion. Some aspects of those questions are being studied and weighed by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government which Congress specifically created to ponder issues of the type here presented.

The bill seeks to bypass certain obligations presently recognized by both Congress and the executive branch of the Government. By implication, Congress would commit itself as far as is legally possible to a long-range plan of comprehensive developments in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

The thoroughness of essential engineering investigations is open to question. Apprehension exists about the geological characteristics of the site chosen for Glen Canyon Dam while a possibility exists that Rainbow Natural Bridge would be impaired. The rock in the Glen Canyon area, the Reclamation Bureau admits, is "poor" compared with the strata underlying other big structures.

Extra steps to insure safety and efficiency of the Glen Canyon unit will increase the cost but there is no assurance that seepage will not result in water losses that will upset all operating plans. The Bureau intends, even while recommending this structure, "to carry out further experiments, to see if we could not solidify that foundation a little more by chemical grouting." Protection of Rainbow Natural Bridge by a dike is contemplated, yet backing up water behind Glen Canyon necessarily will make access to this scenic rarity "more difficult." Indeed, there is question whether Glen Canyon should be erected at all on the site selected.

Evaporation losses behind the major dams will be substantial and an undeniable drain on a river system already threatened with excessive burdens. In order to generate the power required to finance the project, reservoirs will be created from which 1,065,000 acre-feet annually will be lost forever through evaporation. Certainly Congress should face squarely the question whether it is desirable to accept each year an irrecoverable loss equivalent to two-thirds of the quantity of water the United States has guaranteed to deliver to Mexico. Incidentally, the manner in which the Interior Department, even during the course of hearings in 1954, modified estimates of evaporation losses and revised computations is reason for honest question as to whether they may be the sound and final answers.

A major policy problem inherent in this legislation has been foreshadowed in the section of this report dealing with some economic

aspects. In passing on this proposal, Congress should consider whether it wishes to adopt a rubber yardstick for evaluating such developments. This point becomes important since one of the participating units will not result in a single dollar of repayment by water users and the investment ranges so greatly, from \$77 to \$1,530, on the basis of areas benefited.

An unusual delegation of authority would result from enactment of this bill. In the case of at least 12 of the participating projects, Congress is asked to accept without further review results of reexaminations and reappraisals by the Interior Department. A return of this kind to the blank-check procedure which enumbered the Federal Government and short-circuited Congress in past years is deplorable.

Inadequate study has been given, as was noted last year, to the possible effect of water diversions out of the Upper Basin on the quality of water remaining for downstream users. Undeniably exportation of water at higher elevations, where purity is greatest, will impair the quality in lower reaches. There is about 1 ton of salts in each acre-foot of water now coming to the Lower Basin. The effect of the impounding and diversion through works proposed in S. 500 certainly merits more investigation than has been carried out to date.

Conflicting interests in national resources have been cited in connection with this contemplated development. Sincere protests have been registered about the effect of Echo Park Dam on the Dinosaur National Monument and uneasiness shown about the consequences of Glen Canyon Dam to Rainbow Natural Bridge. Surely the historic policy of preserving scenic and historical wonders should not be altered without earnest deliberation.

CONCLUSION

The measure as reported in some regards is a definite improvement over the original proposals for development of the Upper Basin but the willingness of the committee to add projects which have not been thoroughly examined and investigated is cause for alarm.

I cannot concur, however, in the judgment of the majority that the time has come to authorize expenditures of such proportions and establish precedents of such far-reaching consequences, especially when the intended safeguards leave much to chance and the ostensible disclaimer of intent to construe the law of the river is in effect contradicted by testimony concerning the plan of operation of this project.

For the reasons recited in this report, I believe that S. 500 should not be passed.

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator from California.



Calendar No. 131

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 500

[Report No. 128]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 18, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON, (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

MARCH 30 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955

Reported by Mr. ANDERSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in *italic*]

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development
4 of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin,
5 the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority
6 to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce
7 among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to
8 make all needful rules and regulations respecting property
9 belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among

1 others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, stor-
2 ing water for beneficial consumptive use, ~~making it possible~~
3 ~~for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize commencing a~~
4 *program for utilization in the States of the Upper Basin*, con-
5 sistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact,
6 the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado
7 River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
8 pact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid
9 and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the
10 improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydro-
11 electric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes,
12 hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to con-
13 struct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of
14 the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, res-
15 ervoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant
16 works: ~~Cross Mountain~~, Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming
17 Gorge, Glen Canyon, *Juniper*, and Navajo: *Provided*, That
18 the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which
19 will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand
20 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater
21 capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at
22 seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean
23 sea level *and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation*
24 *Board*, and that construction thereof, *and of the Juniper*
25 *unit*, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the

1 basis of further engineering and economic investigations, re-
2 examined the economic justification of ~~such~~ *each* unit and,
3 accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a
4 supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the
5 President that, in his judgment, the benefits of ~~such~~ *each*
6 unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and
7 maintain the following additional reclamation projects (includ-
8 ing power-generating and transmission facilities related
9 thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Cen-
10 tral Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry,
11 Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minne-
12 sota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its
13 confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and
14 other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee,
15 Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, *Parshall,*
16 *Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West*
17 *Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East*
18 *River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand*
19 *Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Grow-*
20 *ers Extension, and Sublette: Provided, That ~~(a)~~ construc-*
21 *tion of the participating projects set forth in this clause*
22 *(2) shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reex-*
23 *amined the economic justification of such project and,*
24 *accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of*
25 *a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through*

1 the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such
2 project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reim-
3 bursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this Act
4 can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each
5 such project shall include, among other things, (i) a re-
6 appraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of
7 the project made by the Secretary after consultation with
8 the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the non-
9 direct benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the
10 total cost of construction of each participating project or
11 separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures au-
12 thorized by section 7 of this Act, to power, irrigation, mu-
13 nicipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any
14 other purpose authorized under reclamation law. Section
15 ~~± (e)~~ of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall, except as
16 hereinafter provided for the San Juan-Chama and the
17 Navajo participating projects, not be applicable to such sup-
18 plemental reports; and, ~~(b)~~ that no appropriation for or
19 construction of the San Juan-Chama project or the Navajo
20 participating project shall be made or begun until coordi-
21 nated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the af-
22 fected States, including ~~(but without limiting the generality~~
23 ~~of the foregoing)~~ the State of Texas, pursuant to the Act
24 of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been

1 approved and authorized by the Congress. Except as here-
2 inafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act
3 of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports:
4 Provided further, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama,
5 Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide,
6 Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa,
7 Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa,
8 Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot
9 Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette
10 participating projects no appropriation for or construction
11 of such participating projects shall be made or begun until
12 coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the
13 affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama
14 and Navajo participating projects shall include the State
15 of Texas), pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1944, and
16 such participating projects shall have been approved and
17 authorized by Act of Congress: Provided further, That with
18 reference to the San Juan-Chama project, it shall be
19 limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a
20 tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the
21 control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan
22 River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed,
23 or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam,
24 and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by

1 the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior
2 in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as admin-
3 istered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

4 SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive develop-
5 ment as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the
6 Upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River
7 system the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colo-
8 rado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to
9 each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
10 pact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to author-
11 ize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further
12 units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional
13 phases of participating projects authorized in this Act, and
14 of new participating projects as additional information be-
15 comes available and additional needs are indicated. It is
16 hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to au-
17 thorize as participating projects only projects (including
18 units or phases thereof)—

19 (1) for the use, in one or more of the States desig-
20 nated in article III of the Upper Colorado River Basin
21 Compact, of waters of the Upper Colorado River system
22 the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those
23 States by that article; and

24 (2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine
25 their probable engineering and economic justification and

feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this Act and Federal reclamation law.

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) : Provided, That (a) ~~irrigation repayment~~ contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise

1 provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for
2 repayment of the *irrigation* obligation assumed thereunder
3 with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not
4 more than fifty years exclusive of any development period
5 authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation
6 distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with
7 an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the
8 Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which
9 has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real
10 property located within its boundaries to assist in making
11 repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the
12 lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) con-
13 tracts relating to municipal water supply may be made
14 without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of
15 section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and
16 (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any
17 participating project, payment of construction costs within
18 the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the
19 Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and partici-
20 pating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of
21 the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of
22 the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper
23 Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper
24 Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the

1 terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States. (Treaty
2 Series 994).

3 SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund
4 in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the
5 Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to
6 as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until
7 expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions
8 of this Act other than section 7.

9 (b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying
10 out the provisions of this Act, other than section 7, shall be
11 credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general
12 fund of the Treasury, *and such funds shall be available for*
13 *expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this*
14 *Act.*

15 (c) All revenues collected in connection with the opera-
16 tion of the Colorado River storage project and participating
17 projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be
18 available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying
19 the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of,
20 and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado
21 River storage project and participating projects, within such
22 separate limitations as may be included in annual appropria-
23 tion acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this

1 section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs
2 of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the
3 water users to repay within the period prescribed in the Act
4 of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made
5 within fifty years after completion of that portion of the
6 project which has not been constructed as of the date of this
7 Act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation fea-
8 tures of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28,
9 1949 (63 Stat. 277) : *Provided*, That revenues credited to
10 the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for
11 construction of the units and participating projects author-
12 ized by or pursuant to this Act. *After repayments to the*
13 *United States of all money required to be repaid under this*
14 *Act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within*
15 *the Upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be author-*
16 *ized by Congress.*

17 (d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating
18 needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the
19 Treasury to return—

20 (1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or
21 any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
22 power pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a period
23 not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of
24 such unit, participating project, or separable feature
25 thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable features thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

(e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the

1 first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit
2 or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by cal-
3 culating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily
4 closing market bid quotations during the month of June
5 next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made,
6 on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of
7 the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more
8 years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such
9 average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per
10 centum.

11 (f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Con-
12 gress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

13 SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating
14 project or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allo-
15 cate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized
16 by section 7 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or
17 feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood
18 control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under
19 reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and
20 maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes
21 shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. On
22 January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Con-
23 gress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal
24 year ~~1955~~ 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the
25 cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado

1 River storage project and the participating projects. The
2 Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the
3 Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irri-
4 gation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and re-
5 payment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by
6 year, in accomplishing full repayment.

7 SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants *and transmission*
8 *lines* authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and
9 maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction
10 with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as
11 to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and
12 energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but
13 no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or
14 interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colo-
15 rado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
16 pact, or the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

17 SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colo-
18 rado River storage project and of the participating projects,
19 the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan,
20 construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational
21 facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the develop-
22 ment of said project or of said participating projects, to
23 conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic
24 objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for
25 public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas

1 created by these projects by such means as are consistent
2 with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities
3 ties to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the
4 propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized
5 ized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from
6 entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary
7 sary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the
8 facilities herein provided *for*, and to dispose of them to Federal,
9 eral, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer,
10 fer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions
11 as will best promote their development and operation in the
12 public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section
13 shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

14 SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed
15 to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in
16 conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project
17 Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment
18 Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the
19 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande
20 Compact of 1938, or the Treaty With the United Mexican
21 States (Treaty Series 994).

22 SEC. 9. Expenditures for the ~~Cross Mountain~~, Flaming
23 Gorge, Glen Canyon, *Juniper*, Navajo and Echo Park
24 initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be
25 made without regard to the soil survey and land classification

1 requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act,
2 1954.

3 SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
4 such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of
5 this Act.

6 SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States
7 are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver,
8 Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally owned water
9 system, such interests in lands and water rights used or ac-
10 quired by the United States solely for the generation of
11 power and other property of the United States as shall be
12 required in connection with the development or use of its
13 Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such
14 interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by
15 Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so
16 limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than
17 water rights for the necessary functions of the United States
18 Government.

19 SEC. 12. (a) In the operation and maintenance of all
20 facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the juris-
21 diction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in
22 the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the In-
23 terior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions
24 of the Colorado River Compact, *the Upper Colorado River*
25 *Basin Compact*, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder

1 Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the
2 United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water
3 from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event
4 of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply,
5 any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an
6 action in the Supreme Court of the United States, *either on*
7 *its own behalf or as parens patriae*, to enforce the provisions
8 of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the
9 United States as a party in such suit or suits. No
10 right to impound or use water for the generation of
11 power or energy, created or established by the building,
12 operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by
13 this Act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise
14 operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the
15 date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado
16 River and its tributaries *System* for domestic or agricultural
17 purposes ~~within any of the States of the Upper Colorado~~
18 ~~River Basin.~~

19 (b) *In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for*
20 *the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River*
21 *system and in programing the storage and release of such*
22 *waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time*
23 *to time with an advisory committee consisting of one repre-*
24 *sentative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin*
25 *States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of*

1 *California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River*
2 *Commission, and one representative of the United States*
3 *Section of the International Boundary Commission, United*
4 *States and Mexico.*

5 SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

6 The terms “Colorado River Basin”, “Colorado River
7 Compact”, “Colorado River System”, “Lee Ferry”, “States
8 of the Upper Division”, “Upper Basin”, and “domestic use”
9 shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the
10 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

11 The term “States of the Upper Colorado River Basin”
12 shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico,
13 Utah, and Wyoming;

14 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin” shall have
15 the same meaning as the term “Upper Basin”;

16 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin Compact”
17 shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11,
18 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona,
19 Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented
20 to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act
21 of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31) ;

22 The term “Rio Grande Compact” shall mean that cer-
23 tain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners
24 representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas
25 and consented to by the Congress of the United States of

1 America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785) ; and
2 The term “treaty with the United Mexican States” shall
3 mean that certain treaty between the United States of Amer-
4 ica and the United Mexican States signed at Washington,
5 District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the
6 utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other
7 rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated
8 November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the
9 Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting
10 to ratification thereof.

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALIOTT, Mr. BARRETT,
Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER,
Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. WATKINS,
and Mr. O'MAHONEY

JANUARY 18, 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

MARCH 30 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 15, 1955
For actions of April 14, 1955
84th-1st, No. 62

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....7	Food, inspection.....3	Reclamation.....8,21
Adjournment.....9,16	Foreign aid.....10	Research.....23
Agricultural commodities.....35	Forestry.....1,33	Rice.....14
Alaska.....29	Information.....7	Roads.....1,4,29,31
Animal disease.....1	Lands, public.....33	School lunch.....1
Appropriations..1,10,34,38	Legislative program.....16	Seed marketing.....27
Auditing.....6	Libraries.....7	Tariffs.....15,18,28
Conservation.....26	Low-income farmers.....24	Taxation.....15
Dairy industry.....23	Marketing.....3,14,25,27	Technical assistance.....10
Disaster relief.....1,37	Minerals.....15,29,33	Trade agreements.....2,15
Education.....36	Organization, executive..36	Trade, foreign.....35
Electrification.....11,39	Patents.....12	Transportation.....7
Experiment stations.....34	Penalty mail.....5	Virgin Islands.....6
Farm program.....17	Personnel.....1,13,32	Wheat.....7,19
Flood control.....30	Prices, support.....14,17,20,22	Wind erosion control.....1
		Wool.....15

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed 2nd supplemental appropriation bill and agreed to additional funds for school lunches. Both Houses received President's message asking that U. S. join Organization for Trade Cooperation. House passed State, Justice, Judiciary appropriation bill. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to repeal REA State formula. (Continued at end of Digest.)

SENATE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 4903 (pp. 3735, 3738-49). Sens. Hayden, Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Bridges, Saltonstall, and Young were appointed Senate conferees (p. 3749). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Kerr to add \$7,000,000 for the school lunch program (pp. 3747-9). Agreed to a committee amendment providing funds for unemployment compensation for Federal employees (p. 3744).

During debate on the bill, Sen. Douglas and Sen. Williams urged more accurate budget estimates in order to reduce the number of supplemental items (pp. 3739-40), Sen. Case (S. Dak.) commended the appropriation of additional funds for forest roads (pp. 3738-9), and Sens. Johnson (Tex.) and Thyne commended the staffs of the Appropriations Committee (pp. 3733-4).

The bill had been reported on April 13 during recess, with amendments (S. Rept. 138)(p. 3723).

As passed by the Senate, the bill includes the following items for this Department: Emergency outbreaks of animal diseases and pests, \$700,000; control of forest pests, \$2,570,000; and language extending availability of funds for wind erosion control and to repay a temporary allocation of \$5,000,000 from the President's disaster relief fund to reactivate the program.

2. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Both Houses received from the President a message recommending that the U. S. join the Organization for Trade Cooperation (H. Doc. 140); to House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee (pp. 3723, 3760-2).

April 14, 1955

3. MARKETING. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 so as to provide a penalty for falsely making, issuing, altering, forging, or counterfeiting any certificate of inspection or grade marking issued by AMS; to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Agriculture Committee (pp. 3723, 3811).
4. ROADS. Both Houses received from the Commerce Department a report on the progress and feasibility of toll roads (pp. 3724, 3811)(H. Doc. 139); to Public Works Committees.
5. PENALTY MAIL. Received from the Post Office Department a proposed bill to amend the Penalty Mail Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3724).
6. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Received from the Assistant Comptroller General an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation (p. 3723).
7. LIBRARIES; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; WHEAT; TRANSPORTATION. Received petitions, etc., favoring additional rural library facilities, additional acreage allotments, removal of the Canadian embargo on Selkirk wheat, and elimination of the bulk commodity exemption regarding inland water carriers (pp. 3724-7).
8. RECLAMATION. S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project, was made the unfinished business (p. 3755).
9. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 18 (p. 3756).

HOUSE

10. STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956. Passed without amendments this bill, H. R. 5502 (pp. 3762-3807). Rejected a series of amendments, offered by Rep. Gross, to delete all funds for the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation and the entertainment funds of the Foreign Service; and to reduce building funds of the State Department and U. S. contributions to the United Nations and specialized agencies (pp. 3784-7). Rejected an amendment offered by Rep. Zablocki to increase by \$6 $\frac{1}{2}$ million the funds provided for international education exchange activities of the State Department (pp. 3797-3801).
Several Members discussed the pros and cons of the technical assistance program and Rep. Dixon stated "those in charge of the affairs in Iran have testified to me that one of our agricultural agents in the field of Iran is greater protection to all liberty-loving countries than a battleship in the harbor" (pp. 3767-80).
11. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. The Poage subcommittee ordered reported to the full Agriculture Committee H. R. 4376, amending sec. 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, so as to repeal the State allotment formula (pp. D291-2).
12. PATENTS. Subcommittee ordered reported to the Judiciary Committee, without recommendation, H. R. 2128, to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls (p. D293).
13. PERSONNEL. Received from the Presidential Adviser on Personnel Management a proposed bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the U. S. for use in the U. S., its Territories or possessions; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3811).

tion is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1716 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second paragraph thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The Postmaster General shall permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions to be used for medical research work under such regulations as he may prescribe with respect to the packaging of such scorpions as will give adequate protection to postal personnel and make for ease of handling by the research worker."

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 131, S. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on next Monday may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIXTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the designation of April 14 as Pan-American Day gives us an opportunity to pause a moment in our unrelenting endeavor to stave off war, to pay homage to an experiment in peace. The learned historian, Arthur Toynbee, has said that history will characterize our epoch, not for the immense technological strides that have been made, not as the atomic age, but rather as the period when man for the first time reached across boundaries of race, religion, and nationality to help his fellow men, for the good of all mankind. If Dr. Toynbee is right, then the organization whose development we commemorate today will occupy a place of honor in history. The growth of pan-Americanism, viewed in historical perspective, will surely be considered by posterity as one of the notable achievements of our era.

Pessimism, born of the failure of the League of Nations and nourished by the frustrations of the United Nations, has been corroding our faith in international organizations for maintaining peace. The Organization of American States stands alone, but firm, as proof of the effectiveness of international cooperation. It stands as a beacon light in the dark, inspiring optimism when doubts assail us. It is fitting that we pause each year to reexamine the evolution of that institution, and by so doing, to rekindle our hope that the noble principles motivating it will spread to other parts of the world.

The Organization of American States was not easily arrived at or built over night. A good many obstacles had to be surmounted; fears had to be assuaged, prejudices eradicated, and self-interests repressed before the 21 nations that make up the membership of the organization could work together in their collective interest. As far back as 1826 the great South American liberator, Bolivar, conceived of the idea of a union of the democracies of the Western Hemisphere. In those days the newly independent nations were menaced by the Holy Alliance; it was Bolivar's idea that by union, the young states could protect themselves against any threat. The rough draft prepared by Bolivar for the conference he called in Panama contains these prophetic words:

This congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. * * * No one of [the nations] will be weak in respect to any other; no one will be stronger. A perfect equilibrium would be established in this truly new order of things. The strength of all would come to the aid of any one which might suffer from the aggression of a foreign enemy.

The Panama Conference, as you know, was a dismal failure. Owing to factional opposition in the United States Congress, there was much delay in appointing the American delegates to the gathering. One of two that were finally appointed died on the way to Panama, and the other arrived too late. The politicians in Buenos Aires, jealous of the leading part played by Colombia, declined the invitation. Paraguay, then a principal state, also remained aloof. When the conference met, only Mexico, Central America, Colombia, and Peru had delegates present. Under the circumstances, Bolivar's magnificent dream of a union of the American nations in the interest of peace, protection, and general advancement, went up in smoke. But it did establish a definite precedent for future inter-American meetings.

Later in the century other attempts were made to get joint action. One gathering in Peru in 1847, with delegates from New Granada, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Chile in attendance, was directed against the United States who was at war with Mexico. The avowed aim of the conference was confederation for the purpose of preserving independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty. No permanent results came from the meeting, or from other conferences of small

groups of Latin American states held later in the century.

In the meantime, some of the South American nations themselves fell into battle with each other. In the 1860's the population of Paraguay was decimated in a war against an alliance consisting of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In 1879, Chile went to war against Peru and Bolivia, and claimed the victor's spoils, which included Peru's nitrate-rich provinces of Tacna and Arica and Bolivia's seacoast. The Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia that began in 1932 killed about 60,000 Bolivians and a good many Paraguayans; continental animosities sharpened when Chile actively supported Bolivia and Argentina threw its aid to Paraguay.

In spite of the bitterness generated from these flare-ups, certain unifying forces were at work. The revolutionary struggles by the American states against Spain and England left in their wake powerful sentiments shared by all the people of the New World. They held themselves to be different from those in the Old World, a new race on a new continent. They believed that Europe was old, corrupt, torn by wars, governed by tyranny, pessimistic, and declining. On the other hand, they believed that America was the opposite, young and vigorous and destined to fulfill mankind's utopian dream.

From these basic convictions, a mass of related sentiments derived. It was held that democratic republican government is the best form of government, all others being inclined to tyranny; that states are equal, irrespective of size and power; that being equal, no state has a right to intervene in the affairs of another; that disputes between states could be settled peacefully by substituting the rule of law for that of force; that cooperation would replace competition. So deep-seated were these convictions, that they withstood the turbulent years of reorganization and intermittent warfare.

While sometimes lost in the clash of fraternal battle, Bolivar's vision of a family of American nations never completely died. In 1889, a first major step was taken to make the dream a reality. In that year, at an invitation from the United States to meet in Washington to discuss commercial matters, 18 of the then 19 American republics responded favorably. This was the first of the series of international conferences of American nations. The delegates to that first feeble effort at cooperation on a hemispheric basis did not realize the precedent they were establishing. One contemporary United States newspaper, reflecting the prevailing opinion, even declared that "the Pan American Conference is pronounced a failure by those most concerned." Today, with the advantage of hindsight, we commemorate the 65th anniversary of that conference as the modest beginning of the mighty union we have today.

But not all was clear sailing for the inter-American ship after the first Pan American conference. In the first decades of the 20th century the United States pursued a course that was bitter-

ly unpopular in Latin America. This policy consisted of unilateral intervention of United States Armed Forces in other American nations to protect United States lives and property or to prevent real or imagined threats of European intervention; the practice of dollar diplomacy, whereby the United States sought to control the finances of certain of the Caribbean countries; and the decision on the part of the United States to apply the Monroe Doctrine without consulting the other American States. Under the circumstances, it was unlikely that progress toward unity could be achieved.

All of us know the happy consequences that resulted when the United States signed the treaty at Montevideo in 1933 pledging nonintervention. With the shift to the good neighbor policy, the whole concept of pan-Americanism had a rebirth. After that, in rapid succession, the sister republics laid the foundations for hemispheric solidarity. When war clouds began to darken the horizon in Europe, the nations of America gathered at Buenos Aires and agreed upon a procedure for consultation in emergencies. Actual outbreak of World War II put the machinery of consultation into effect. During the war, the American nations worked in close cooperation. After the war the 21 republics formalized their system of mutual defense and peaceful settlement of disputes by the Rio and Bogotá pacts. Today the Organization of American States is a far cry from the timid excursion into inter-American cooperation of 65 years ago. It comes very close to realizing Bolivar's dream of the New World united in defense of the noble principles of freedom and independence.

But today the threat to our institutions comes not only from physical attack, as Bolivar feared from the hands of the holy alliance. Instead, every country in the Western Hemisphere is under constant, insidious assault. The current enemy, international communism, has created a new dimension in international warfare. Communism attacks at the very moral fibers of a nation. It has developed a modern Trojan horse technique of boring from within, of first spreading dissatisfaction and fear and suspicion, and then presenting itself as the savior. In Latin America, this precise moment in history is auspicious for the Communist scheme. The people have awakened from their apathy and resignation. They are seething with discontent for their lot, and no longer accept gnawing hunger and disease as their portion. The Communist defection of Guatemala, however, short lived, should serve as a warning that it can happen here. The removal through revolution of Communists from influential posts in Guatemala has done nothing to relieve the conditions that fostered the rise of those Communists in the first place.

All the mutual defense pacts and pledges of solidarity will not halt the war of ideas the Communists are waging:

I do not mean by this statement to belittle the effectiveness of the inter-American system. Its continuous and upward growth in the face of difficulties, culminating in the fine Organization of American States which exists today is an island in the turbulent sea of international relations. I do mean, however, that we must not stop working to make it even more effective. We must not be so satisfied with our handiwork to date that we will permit our thinking with regard to Latin America to ossify. We must keep it fluid so that we are prepared to meet every new challenge in this dynamic and changing world.

Since it is presently unlikely that the Soviet Union will launch physical warfare upon one or more of our sister republics, we must be prepared to combat a different type of assault. The Latin American delegates to the conference in Rio last November pointed the way. They need help to raise the living standards of their people quickly, before they turn in desperation to the false promises held out to them by the Communists. Our full-hearted cooperation with Latin America in the economic field is as essential to the preservation of American institutions as is our military and political cooperation. If we are to meet the threat posed by Communist infiltration, we must take bold, original measures. Fortunately, the inter-American system has not been rigid. It has proved again and again that it can, so to speak, roll with the punches.

It is my fervent hope and prayer on this 65th anniversary of the Pan American movement that the unity of purpose of the sister republics of the Western Hemisphere will be increased and strengthened, and that the nations of the New World, through sincere efforts at cooperation, will march steadily toward the fulfillment of Bolivar's vision of a prosperous and free continent, at peace with the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who believes in Pan American understanding and unity, I appreciate what the Senator from Florida has said about the history of the pan American movement, and I wish to associate myself with him in his remarks.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the supplemental appropriation bill, which he has just joined in passing, there is an additional contribution to the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History, in furtherance of an act passed by Congress last year. I hope it will have some additional value by virtue of having been passed on the 65th anniversary of the Pan American Union.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks. I feel certain that the people of Massachusetts value highly the Senator's interest in conditions around the world as well as in the affairs of his own people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as has already been noted, today is the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and because of my interest in the subject as a member of the Subcommittee on American Republics, I wish to pay tribute to the great success which has attended the Organization of American States.

This organization was established in 1889, the first Pan American Conference having been held in Washington. From that early beginning the organization has developed into one of the most remarkable international structures the world has seen.

The Pan American Union and the Association of American States are a great tribute to the good will and consistency of purpose of the republics of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres in this part of the world; and to their ability to get together on their mutual problems, and increasingly to strengthen the effectiveness of the Organization of American States.

Pan-American Day as such was first proclaimed 25 years ago in commemoration of this organization and its activities before that time. As I mentioned a moment ago, it is a system of voluntary associations of independent republics, which has been a stimulus and in some ways has been a pattern, for other organizations in other parts of the world.

We have recently seen several examples of its success—the Guatemalan situation; the recent tension between Costa Rica and Nicaragua; the solution of problems in other nations in South America; border disputes and the commissions which have been voluntarily set up to solve those disputes peacefully and without resort to the force which before that time had been all too often used.

And so, Mr. President, I merely want to pay tribute today to the vigor and the unity with which the American republics have successfully solved, in the main, the problems which occur in this hemisphere, and the problems which constantly beset the nations so far as their associations with one another are concerned. I hail this day as an anniversary, and I am sure we can look forward in the future to increasing strength and increasing success of this great American institution.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 19, 1955
For actions of April 18, 1955
84th-1st, No. 63

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	4,41	Housing loans.....	2	Rubber.....	26
Conservation.....	16	Labor.....	39	Sugar.....	7,17,31
Cotton.....	25,42	Legislative program....	20	Surplus commodities	
Dairy industry.....	12,25	Loans, farm.....	2		1,23,25,42
Drought relief.....	29	Loyalty Day.....	13	Surplus property.....	38
Electrification.....	8,21	Monopolies.....	5	Tariffs.....	34
Family-size farms....	18,22	Patents.....	14	Taxation.....	16
Farm plans.....	28	Personnel.....	10,15,30	Trade agreements.....	19
Farm problems.....	25	Prices, farm.....	25	Trade, foreign.....	34
Farm relief.....	40	support.....	18	Veterans' benefits.....	37
Foreign aid.....	9	Property.....	6,16,27	Water resources.....	24
Forestry.....	3,32,36	Reclamation.....	11	Wheat.....	11,16,33
Grain.....	23	Research.....	38	Wind erosion.....	29
Hardboard.....	19	Roads.....	35		

HIGHLIGHTS; House passed bills to: repeal requirement that private stocks be replaced by CCC stocks under Public Law 480; protect national forests from mining claims for sand, etc.; modify VA farm housing law. House sent 2nd supplemental appropriation bill to conference. Senate debated Colorado reclamation project. Sen. Wiley urged increased milk consumption by Armed Forces. (Continued at end of Digest)

HOUSE

1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Passed without amendment S. 752, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to eliminate the requirement that private stocks exported thereunder be replaced from CCC stocks (p. 3881). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Rep. Hill inserted and commended a report by this Department, "USDA Surplus Food Distribution Continues to Increase" (pp. 3886-8).
2. FARM-HOUSING LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 5106, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing (p. 3880).
3. FORESTRY. Passed as reported H. R. 230, to protect the national forests from certain mining claims relating to sand, common stone, gravel, common pumice and pumicite, and cinders (p. 3880).
4. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Reps. Cannon, Rooney, Preston, Taber, and Clevenger were appointed House conferees on this bill, H. R. 2903 (p. 3876). Senate conferees have been appointed.
5. MONOPOLIES. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4954, to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the U. S. to recover damages under the antitrust laws and establishing a uniform statute of limitations (p. 3893)(H. Rept. 422).

April 18, 1955

6. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Both Houses received the Hoover Commission report on surplus property (H. Doc. 141); to Government Operations Committees (pp. 3893, 3815). This report will not be available from the Legislative Reporting Staff except for an emergency need. Pursuant to a special arrangement, each agency of the Department is ordering its own supply of the report directly from GPO.
7. SUGAR. Rep. Gubser urged increased domestic sugar quotas in connection with legislation to amend and extend the Sugar Act (p. 3892).
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Abernethy commended a plan "under which the need of the TVA for power facilities in its area could be met by the issuance of bonds to be paid off through receipts from the sale of power" (p. 3876).
9. FOREIGN AID. Reps. Gross and Gavin criticized the foreign-aid program (pp. 3876-7).
10. PAY RAISE. Rep. Pelly said pay raises for classified employees should not depend upon action taken regarding postal employees (pp. 3876-7).

SENATE

11. RECLAMATION. Began debate on S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River reclamation project, agreed to committee amendments en bloc, and agreed by unanimous consent that Senators Kuchel or Neuberger may offer amendments thereto at any time prior to final passage of the bill (pp. 3835-3861, 3866-73).
During debate on the bill Sen. Douglas claimed that increasing the amount of fertile land under cultivation would conflict with reduction in wheat acreage production and that "this project is primarily--insofar as its agricultural phases are concerned--for the purpose of providing feed for livestock" (pp. 3869-70).
12. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Sen. Wiley inserted his statement urging the installation of automatic milk vending machines at all U. S. Armed Forces installations, and also a Department of Defense letter on this subject (p. 3828).
13. LOYALTY DAY. The Judiciary Committee ordered favorably reported S. J. Res. 58 to designate the first day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day (p. D296).
14. PATENTS. The Judiciary Committee reported an original resolution, S. Res. 92, (without written report) to provide that this committee conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights (p. 3823).
15. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the U. S. for use in the U. S., its Territories or possessions; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3816).
16. WHEAT; PROPERTY; TAXATION; CONSERVATION. Received petitions, etc., favoring storage of CCC surplus wheat in Calif.; payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on Federally-owned lands; and continued surveys and planning of Kansas construction projects for the conservation of soil and water (pp. 3817-8).
17. SUGAR. Sen. Thye inserted a Kennedy, Minn., Chamber of Commerce resolution urging increased domestic sugar quotas; and Sen. Humphrey inserted Governor Freeman's (Minn.) letters to him and the President urging extension of the

West Memphis power, after the war situation had calmed.

You explore timidly the "guaranteed profit" angle of Dixon-Yates, without mentioning the fact that two former high officials of Mr. Dixon's companies have said for publication that the company is guaranteed against loss. There is nothing in your "complete picture" to indicate that one interpretation of a clause in this contract requires the AEC to pay the full price of power even though the plant produces none. Neither is there any hint of the contract clauses which give the Dixon company the chance to take power it is selling to the Government at 3.99 mills for its own use at 1.863 mills, under terms which could mean as much as \$12 million a year profit to the Dixon companies. The figures have been published, without challenge, by Walter Von Tresckow, who is biased to be sure (because he wanted to bid but was brushed off), but an experienced man in electricity and finance nonetheless.

Your "Informative story" mentions the tax clause, without saying that the Dixon-Yates proposal was so far out of line with precedent in years of Government purchase contracts that the United States Senate adopted special legislation to bring it back into line. You do not mention the many "adjustments" made in favor of the Government after objectors such as the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Milwaukee Journal, and the Commercial-Appeal brought the deal before the public.

We further object to this "complete account" leaving out the announcement of Memphis city officials that Memphis will answer its own power needs by financing its own generating plant, if necessary. This one fact removes the whole objective of the Dixon-Yates deal. It has a place in any fair summary of this situation.

And if you use some of your space to tell of the protective attitude of this region toward TVA, you surely should let your readers know that Middle South is the present-day heir of the very company which Memphis voted out when TVA was voted in.

We are close to this situation. We have worked through its details at great length and we are thoroughly convinced that it is against the public interest. You have only to ask: Why was there no opportunity to bid on this job? To realize it was rigged from the start. We are surprised that Mr. Hard, ostensibly a reporter, would approach the story with so little regard for objectivity—that he, and you, would violate the primary rule of journalism that requires examination of both sides of a controversy.

Your truly,

FRANK AHLGREN.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make to the Senate. I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. After the roll is called, and a quorum is developed, the Senate will receive a visit from a very distinguished former Member of this body.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have in the Chamber today a

former colleague who has come back to pay us a visit.

Many honors have come to him since he left our ranks more than a decade ago. One of those honors was the highest office in our land, the Presidency of the United States.

He led our Nation through some of the most serious crises in its history. He traveled abroad, and in the name of all our people, dealt with foreign potentates on an equal footing. At all times he displayed courage and fortitude and patriotism that gained him the respect even of his enemies.

However, Mr. President, I should like to welcome him back today as a man who is returning for a visit to a dearly beloved home, peopled by very beloved friends.

His life is an important chapter in Senate history. He is already a part of our traditions and a part of our lore. This is a better Senate because he was a part of it.

On behalf of my colleagues, I say: "Welcome back Mr. Truman. The latch-string is always out whenever you pass this way."

Mr. President, I believe it would be very appropriate if we might have the pleasure of hearing from our distinguished former colleague, and with that purpose in view, I ask unanimous consent that he be given the privilege at this time to submit whatever remarks he may care to make.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the request made by the distinguished majority leader, and to join in welcoming to the Senate a distinguished former Member of this body, one of two living ex-Presidents of the United States. He will always find here a most cordial bipartisan welcome.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of Mr. Truman, the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to enable Senators to greet our former colleague.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the former President of the United States, and our former colleague. [Applause.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, thank you very, very much.

When I was a Member of the Senate the rules prohibited applause in the Senate. Has that rule been repealed? [Laughter.]

I cannot tell the Members of the Senate how very much I appreciate the privilege and the honor which has been accorded me. The happiest days of my 30 years of political life were spent at the desk where I now stand. I do not

know of anything I could say that could impress you with the full meaning of the statement that my heart has always been in this Chamber. I wanted to remain here, but circumstances prevented it.

I met with an experience this morning which I never expected to have. I appeared before the distinguished Foreign Relations Committee of this body, on the wrong side of the table. I wish to say that never in my entire life have I been more courteously treated than I was at that meeting of the committee. I trust the statement which I made will be a contribution to the information of that great committee.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will always continue to be, as it has been in the past, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world. It is an honor for any man to serve in this great body, and I consider the 10 years spent here by me the greatest 10 years of my entire life.

I consider this visit a very great privilege, Mr. President, and I appreciate the honor which has been extended to me.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the light of the uncertainty of how the Senate will proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there be no further morning business, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that the bill now before the Senate is the Colorado River storage project bill, and that it is now in order to proceed with the consideration of any amendments thereto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "use", it is proposed to strike out "making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize" and insert in lieu thereof "commencing a program for utilization in the States of the upper basin."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, if he intends to propose to have all the committee amendments agreed to, and then to proceed to discuss the bill. I ask the question, in part, because I understand the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] intends to offer an amendment, and I was wondering what the procedure would be.

Mr. ANDERSON. My thought was, if I may respond to the distinguished Senator from California, to have the Senate proceed to agree to the committee amendments, recognizing the fact that the Senator from Oregon subsequently will offer an amendment dealing with Echo Park Dam. I should certainly wish to protect his parliamentary right to offer that amendment. I feel sure that it would be in order at a subsequent time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments from the floor will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator from California get a sufficient answer to his question? The procedure being followed is merely the usual procedure, having the committee amendments acted on first. After the committee amendments have been acted on, then it will be in order for any Senator to offer an amendment to the perfected bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to be certain of my understanding with respect to an additional point. As I recall, 1 or 2 proposed amendments of which I was the author were offered in committee, but I do not believe they were accepted by the committee. Language somewhat different was adopted. If the amendments of the committee shall be adopted, is my understanding correct that I may, at a subsequent time, if I so desire, move to strike any of the committee amendments, or to substitute other language therefor?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to have the Chair rule on that question, but certainly is my understanding that the Senator from California could subsequently offer an amendment to strike out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that committee amendments are subject to amendment, and if any Senator has any amendment to offer to one of the committee amend-

ments, it should be offered at the time the committee amendment is pending.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I not have the right to ask that my suggestions be adopted? In other words, do I not have a right to ask that subsequently any Member of the Senate shall have the opportunity to move that a committee amendment be stricken or changed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Most certainly, if the Senator asks unanimous consent, and it is granted, that may be done. The Senator is asking that certain amendments he desires to offer to the committee amendments be deferred until all the committee amendments are adopted, and that he be permitted to offer them at that time.

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Let me phrase it differently, and see if the Senator from New Mexico will agree with the request.

I ask unanimous consent that at any time prior to the vote on the final passage of S. 500, any Member of the Senate may have the right to offer an amendment by which a committee amendment previously adopted may be stricken or changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the Senator from California, his unanimous-consent request is that at any time prior to the final passage of S. 500 any Member of the Senate may offer amendments to the committee amendments which previously have been adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from California would modify his request so as to make it apply only to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think his original request was too broad. There is no disposition on our part to foreclose any amendments. If the unanimous-consent request were so limited, I would have no objection to it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I adopt the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico as my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request now is that prior to the final passage of S. 500, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be permitted to offer amendments to the committee amendments which have been adopted before that time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the second committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 16, after the word "works", it is proposed to strike out "Cross Mountain."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 17, after the word "Canyon", to insert "Juniper."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 23, after the word "level", to insert "and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board,"; in line 24, after the word "thereof", to insert "and of the Juniper unit."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in view of the agreement we have had with the Senator from California, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the remaining committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The remaining committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "each;" in line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "each;" in line 15, after the word "Navajo", to insert "Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette;" in line 20, after the word "That", to strike out "(a);" on page 4, line 14, after the word "law", to strike out: "Section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall, except as hereinafter provided for the San Juan Chama and the Navaho participating project, not be applicable to such supplemental reports; and, (b) that no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan Chama project or the Navajo participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress."

At the top of page 5, in line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to insert: "Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navajo Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navajo participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress;" on page 6, beginning in line 4, to strike out:

"SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof)—

"(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, of waters of the upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

"(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act and Federal reclamation law; and insert:

"SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated."

On page 7, line 24, after "(a)", to strike out "irrigation repayment"; on page 8, line 2, after the word "the", to insert "irrigation"; on page 9, line 12, after the word "Treasury", to insert "and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this act."; on page 10, line 12, after the word "act", to insert "After repayments to the United States of all moneys required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress."

On page 12, line 24, after the word "year", to strike out "1955" and insert "1956"; on page 13, line 7, after the word "powerplants", to insert "and transmission lines"; on page 14, line 8, after the word "provided", to insert "for"; in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "Cross Mountain"; in line 23, after the word "Canyon," to insert "Juniper"; on page 15, line 19, after the numerals "12", to insert "(a)" in line 24, after the word "Compact", to insert "the upper Colorado River Basin compact"; on page 16, line 6, after the word "States", to insert "either on its own behalf or as *parens patriae*"; in line 16, after the word "River", to strike out "and its tributaries" and insert "System"; in line 17, after the word "purposes", to strike out "within any of the States of the upper Colorado River Basin"; and after line 18, to insert:

"(b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programming the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of 1 representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, 1 representative of the Colorado River Board of California, 1 representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and 1 representative of the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, commencing a program for utilization in the States of the upper basin, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the

upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navaho: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and that construction thereof, and of the Juniper unit, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of each unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of each unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette: *Provided*, That construction of the participating projects set forth in this clause (2) shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reexamined the economic justification of such project and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reimbursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this act can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each such project shall include, among other things, (i) a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of the project made by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the total cost of construction of each participating project or separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures authorized by section 7 of this act, to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any other purpose authorized under reclamation law. Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been sub-

mitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress: *Provided further*, That with reference to the San Juan-Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the irrigation obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under, or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the basin fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 7.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 7, shall be credited

to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury, and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this act.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made within 50 years after completion of that portion of the project which has not been constructed as of the date of this act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277): *Provided*, That revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act. After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 5 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this act within a period not exceeding 50 years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable features thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

(e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such

average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by sec. 7 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorize nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided for, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 9. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, Navaho, and Echo Park initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classifi-

cation requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colo., for use as a part of its municipally owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power and other property of the United States as shall be required in connection with the development or use of its Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than water rights for the necessary functions of the United States Government.

SEC. 12. (a) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States, either on its own behalf or as *parens patriae*, to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. No right to impound or use water for the generation of power or energy, created or established by the building, operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by this act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado River system for domestic or agricultural purposes.

(b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programming the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of one representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and one representative of the United States section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

SEC. 13. As used in this act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin," "Colorado River compact," "Colorado River system," "Lee Ferry," "States of the upper division," "upper basin," and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

The term "States of the upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "upper basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785); and

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, so that I may be correctly advised by the Chair, I should like to inquire whether amendments will be in order prior to the vote on the final passage of S. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that is the unanimous-consent agreement which applies to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the Chair was engaging in a colloquy with the junior Senator from California, I did not hear all that was said. Am I to understand that an amendment to S. 500 will be in order up until the time of the final vote on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to S. 500 are in order now. The unanimous-consent agreement obtained by the Senator from California for himself and the Senator from Oregon was that amendments to the committee amendments would be received from those two Senators up to the vote on the final passage of the bill. Amendments to the bill which have nothing to do with committee amendments are in order now.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for my better information, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Senate bill 500 is before the Senate, and the committee amendments to the bill have been adopted en bloc. Therefore, we now have before us the bill as reported by the committee, and all the committee amendments have been adopted. Do I correctly understand that the parts of the bill represented by the committee amendments are now sacred and are not now subject to amendment, except as amendments may be proposed by the two Senators who, by unanimous consent, were given the privilege of submitting amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the parts of the bill which have been amended by committee amendment can be altered now only by the submission of amendments by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] or the Senator from Ore-

gon [Mr. NEUBERGER], or under a motion to reconsider a committee amendment heretofore adopted which some Senator may desire to have changed.

Mr. FLANDERS. So amendments to the committee amendments can be made now only through the process of reconsideration. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, within 2 days.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me state there is no desire on the part of those who are sponsoring the bill to shut off the offering of amendments.

The original request by the Senator from California, if granted, would have resulted in our going over and over the same ground. If the Senator from Vermont wishes to submit an amendment, I can assure him that he will not have to resort to any unusual practice in order to obtain consideration of his amendment. Nothing of that sort is in the heart of any Member of the Senate, I am sure; and I assure him that the bill is open to amendment by him or by any other Senator. The only desire is to prevent our going over and over the same matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I was as much interested in the general principle involved as I was in this particular instance. I have been here only 8 years, and I keep learning things I did not know.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my only concern in raising the point at all was in the interest of orderly procedure. I was acquainted with the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] intended to offer an amendment. I wished to protect my own rights in opposing any of the committee amendments. However, it seemed to me that orderly procedure would require that the bill be first discussed generally, pro and con. Thereafter, Members of the Senate would be a little better informed as to what they might wish to do with respect to amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not the understanding that the action which has been taken by the Senate to expedite orderly procedure on the bill would permit amendments in the first degree, even with respect to those parts of the bill which were amended by committee amendments? Was not that the intent of the author of the unanimous-consent request, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he proceeded to clarify the situation? Was it not the intent to have before us for consideration a single piece of legislation?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator addresses that question to me, I think the Chair had ruled that, by the simple process of moving to reconsider any amendment which has been adopted by the Senate on the recommendation of the committee, any Member of the Senate may exercise his rights.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I understood the statement of the Senator

from New Mexico, amendments in the second degree would also be permitted. I ask the Chair whether or not amendments in the second degree are also permissible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that committee amendments are amendments in the first degree, and that any amendments to committee amendments are amendments in the second degree. No further amendments could be offered, under the rules, to the same committee amendment, after one amendment to the committee amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have the honor today to present to the Senate for its consideration S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project, as reported favorably with amendments from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with only one dissenting voice. Twelve Senators signed the report, No. 128; one presented separate views with respect to one feature of the bill; a thirteenth Senator filed minority views, and 2 members of the committee abstained from taking a position on the report.

To the minds of most western people concerned with the conservation for use of the precious water resources of the arid and semiarid areas, S. 500 is perhaps the most vital legislation of this character before the Congress since the reclamation law of 1902, which was sponsored by President Theodore Roosevelt. In the 53 years that have elapsed since that memorable and far-reaching law was enacted, most of the West has moved forward.

Irrigation, which is essential to the stabilization of agriculture west of the 100th meridian, has expanded under reclamation and private initiative. Multiple-purpose dams financed by congressional appropriations store water for irrigation, flood control, river regulation, recreation, and the production of hydro-power for industries, rural and urban use. Power revenues assist in repaying irrigation costs beyond the ability of water users to repay. In 50 years, Congress has appropriated approximately \$2.5 billion for reclamation construction. The areas in the West created or supported by reclamation developments since 1916 have paid more than that amount into the Federal Treasury in income and other Federal taxes.

I have many times pointed out, with respect to the Salt River project in the State of Arizona, that not only is the Federal Government receiving back the entire cost of the project, but the farmers under that project, because of the water which is supplied to their farms, have paid to the Federal Treasury, in income taxes alone, three times the entire cost of the Salt River project.

California, from Oregon to the Mexican border, has shared in this expansion stimulated by Federal appropriations. The Pacific Northwest has likewise set a pace for industrial growth, and the Missouri River Basin project, authorized by the Congress in 1944, is underway to protect seven more States from the ravages of drought, wind, and floods. Cur-

rent estimates of the costs to complete the Missouri Basin project approach \$5 billion, including the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

Only the upper Colorado River Basin awaits recognition by the Congress of the United States as an area that needs and deserves conservation of its water resources for irrigation to stabilize its agriculture and hydropower to stimulate its industrial and rural development and aid in returning the costs to the Federal Treasury. Incidental recreational and flood-control benefits round out the multiple-purpose features of the project to be authorized by S. 500.

The States of the upper basin are Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

S. 500 has four principal purposes, which are outlined more in detail in the report, and which will be discussed more fully by other Senators.

First, it would authorize 6 holdover storage reservoirs, 5 of which have hydropower plants, transmission lines, and incidental works. These reservoirs are vital to the control of the Colorado River and to insure that the upper basin can fulfill the commitments in the Colorado River compact of 1922 not to deplete the flow of the stream below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years. The power installations will assure double or triple use of the waters of the Colorado without affecting the obligations of the upper basin. Power revenues will repay to the Federal Treasury not only the returnable costs of the reservoirs, facilities, et cetera, but will contribute materially to returning irrigation costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay. The ultimate installed power capacity to be authorized is 1,200,000 kilowatts.

Second, S. 500 would authorize 12 participating irrigation projects. In these projects are 132,360 acres of land to be brought under irrigation, and 234,000 acres to receive supplemental irrigation water to firm up their present supplies. Before construction can begin, the Secretary of the Interior must reexamine the projects and report to Congress.

Third, the bill recognizes by conditional authorization 21 additional projects or units in various stages of planning, and requires approval and authorization by the Congress before construction. In the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho projects in New Mexico, reports must be submitted to the State of Texas. In the 21 additional projects are 832,000 acres of land to be newly irrigated or receive supplemental water.

Finally, the bill recognizes that the works authorized constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin, and that the specific authorizations in this bill are not intended to limit or preclude the consideration and authorization by Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned under the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The repayment provisions of the bill, following very closely recommendations

made by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior, are designed to achieve, so far as practicable, the concurrent return of expenditures for power and irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply purposes, insofar as expenditures therefor are made concurrently. The power and municipal and industrial water supply expenditures are returned with interest. All reimbursable costs are returnable within 50-year periods, and this is specifically required by section 4 of the bill as amended.

The Senate, of course, is aware that there is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States litigation between Arizona and California et al. The committee considered the propriety or advisability of authorization of the works set forth in S. 500. It was the conclusion of an overwhelming majority of the committee that nothing in the pending litigation warrants delay in authorization of the works proposed in the bill, and that such is the case even if Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming should be impleaded.

The works included in the bill as recommended by the Upper Colorado River Commission for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are fully justified because they are designed only to make effective part of the perpetual apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually made to the upper basin in the Colorado River compact, and partake of the character of works heretofore authorized under the Federal reclamation program. Therefore, the committee concludes that the authorization of this plan of development, being plainly within the upper basin apportionment, cannot and should not be construed as detrimental in any respect to the rightful interests of Arizona, California, or Nevada, as lower basin States, whether as litigants or otherwise. However, the committee calls attention to section 12 of the bill which makes it possible for any Colorado River Basin State to institute litigation promptly in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the event questions arise regarding the legality of the operation of any works herein authorized or of any other works on the river.

Possible frustration of efforts effectively to litigate such questions is avoided by waiver of the immunity of the United States from such a suit. Thus, all States of the Colorado River Basin are fully protected against the operation of any works on the Colorado River system in contravention of the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Mexican treaty. Furthermore, the provision contained in the bill—section 12 (b)—for consultation with an advisory committee in connection with the operation of works on the river will tend, as a practical matter, to obviate misunderstanding and to reduce occasions for litigation.

We feel that it was satisfactorily established by the evidence that the aggregate of the consumptive use of water that will be made, if all of the works hereby proposed to be authorized are eventually

constructed after meeting the various conditions imposed, when added to consumptive use already being made in the upper division States, will amount to less than two-thirds of the apportionment being made to the upper basin under the compact. When all storage units and participating projects named in this bill are constructed, the aggregate of all consumptive uses in the upper basin would not exceed 4.8 million acre-feet of water per annum. This would leave an unused apportionment of 2.7 million acre-feet of the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to the upper basin to meet any contingencies arising out of litigation over varying interpretations of the compact. In the circumstances, the continuity of the water supply for the lower basin would be assured.

Before outlining the estimated overall construction costs, I should mention the Eden irrigation project in Wyoming, previously authorized and now nearing completion. This project, as well as the Paonia irrigation project in Colorado, also previously authorized and partly constructed, will be aided financially by the Colorado River storage project power revenues.

The estimated construction costs of the Colorado River storage projects authorized by Senate bill 500 are: 6 storage units, \$782,883,000; 12 participating irrigation projects, \$310,116,800; total cost of authorized units, \$1,092,999,800.

The estimated construction costs of the units requiring further approval and authorization by the Congress are: 21 participating projects, \$558,173,300.

Including the Eden and Paonia projects previously authorized, the estimated construction costs of all projects mentioned in Senate bill 500 total \$1,658 million, or \$1.6 billion.

Mr. President, many Senators from the western States, who have been particularly interested in this subject and who have been very faithful in furthering the development, will undoubtedly speak at some length on the proposed legislation. Therefore, I do not believe it would be fair for me to inflict on them, before they have had an opportunity to speak, a discussion by me which runs to 30 or 40 pages, in which I try to point out that the establishment of the project involved in the bill will not in any way cause difficulty in the agricultural picture throughout the United States.

I hope the able and distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is known as one of the financial geniuses of Congress, will discuss the financial implications of the proposed project. For myself, I feel that I have had some background in agriculture and have had an opportunity to study agriculture, and on the basis of that knowledge I wish to state for the RECORD my testimony that the project can be started and completed without in any way jeopardizing the agricultural prospects of any agricultural State of the Union.

However, I do not feel it would be right for me to make my further remarks before other Senators have had an opportunity to speak on the pending bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy to yield to the very distinguished Senator from Utah, who has worked on the bill unceasingly and effectively. I congratulate him for what he has done.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to ask him whether he will be available to answer some questions with respect to the statement to which he has referred.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sure there will be a number of questions I shall wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico, and I believe other Members of the Senate will also wish to propound some questions to him.

Mr. ANDERSON. When I speak on the agricultural question, I hope any Senator who is interested in American agriculture and who feels he has a problem in connection with it, and desires to ask me a question on that subject, will feel free to do so.

I shall deal with present population trends and with a subject on which a study was started almost immediately after I became Secretary of Agriculture, namely, the question of how best to utilize the land mass of the Nation and how best to apply it and use it in order to provide all the food needs of the United States.

Anyone who can look at the agricultural picture and not conclude that we shall have some difficulty with our food supplies within the next 25 years, and probably even within the next 10 years, has not read the story of this country correctly. I shall want to discuss that subject as frankly as I can, and I hope some enlightenment may be afforded.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Finally, I should like to say that in our labors on the bill we have enjoyed very pleasant working relationship with the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who finds himself in opposition to the bill. I wish that the good people of his State could have kept their opposition to the bill on the high level on which the distinguished junior Senator from California has kept his.

A few days ago I received in the mail the pamphlet I hold in my hand, which refers to a "new \$4 billion tax burden" threatening us. It sets forth the amount of the tax burden which will fall on the various States. I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has read this pamphlet. I find that my State will be assessed \$15 million of the cost. Arizona will be assessed \$20 million of the cost. California will have to bear \$372 million worth of the burden.

I mentioned a moment ago that anyone who will take the time to check the experience of the Reclamation Bureau throughout the West, will realize, as does the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that these vast projects and other prospective projects which are coming along will also be revenue-producing projects. I mention that because in

one of these writings it is mentioned that the Arizona Frying Pan project will be helped on its way by the passage of this proposed legislation.

While the Senator from Colorado is on the floor I wish to say that I hope to have a final markup of his bill, in which he is so greatly interested, the Arizona-Fryingpan project, next Wednesday. We expect to have the bill before the full committee on the following Tuesday. Here, again, is an example of the Federal Government stepping in to do what an individual State cannot do, and making it possible for the people of Colorado to enjoy benefits and to anticipate the population growth which is now ahead of them.

I do not wish to discuss the bill which is coming before the committee. It will be amply discussed on the floor. But one of the purposes of the bill about which the people of California are a little worried is that of supplying water to municipalities in Colorado. One of those municipalities, the city of Colorado Springs, is enjoying an unusual building boom, and the Federal Government, through the utilization of the water, will be able to develop that fine community.

Therefore, Mr. President, I welcome the bill which has been introduced and on which hearings have been held. I predict that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works will report favorably on the bill. I believe all these measures, such as the upper Colorado River bill, the Arizona-Fryingpan bill, and proposed legislation dealing with districts in California which involve the conservation of water resources, are extremely important and that the attention of the Congress needs to be called to them as we plan the food needs for future years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the business of the Senate today is Calendar No. 131, Senate bill 500, dealing with the upper Colorado storage project.

On the 16th of March I was given the opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it was holding its hearing upon this bill.

I have before me the text of my testimony. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in an appropriate place in the body of the RECORD after the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] shall have opened the debate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY AT HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, MARCH 16, 1955

I notice that you have before the committee a map of the upper Colorado River Basin. I would like to distribute to each member of the committee a miniature copy of this map so that you will have them before you while I talk.

I want to speak about a flowing river, but if I were to give a title to the talk I wish to make, I would call it "They Want To Throw Us to the Dinosaurs."

OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS CONTRAVENE COMPACT

The arguments which have been made against this upper Colorado River storage project, in my opinion, are completely contrary to the policy of the Government, since the Colorado River compact was signed by the authority of the Congress and approved by the Congress.

The attack rises from two sources: First, those in the lower basin, who fear that if the upper basin is permitted to use the water which was allocated to it, the lower basin will somehow be deprived of some of its rights; second, those who seem to believe that somehow or another the building of Echo Park Dam will create a precedent for raids upon national parks and national monuments all over the United States.

The answer to the first, Mr. Chairman, is that in drawing the bill which is before the Senate, S. 500, an attempt was made to provide that what is to be done in the upper Colorado Basin would be done solely in compliance with the Colorado River compact and the various acts which have been passed since that time.

BUILDING OF DAM CANNOT PRESAGE INVASION OF PARKS

The answer to the second is that the law and the facts prove that the building of this dam cannot be a precedent. I undertake to show you today, if I do not trespass upon your time, that is not true, and that, quite to the contrary, the expansion of the Dinosaur National Park—or national monument, I should call it, because it is not a park and never was a park—the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument by Executive order in 1938 was an invasion of a policy already laid down by Government agencies to devote the area where the Echo Park Dam is to be built to the development of power.

Now let us take a look at this map.

The history of the Colorado River and its tributaries will never be told. The National Park Service has attempted to tell part of it in a little booklet which is entitled "Dinosaur National Monument: Past and Present," published by the Government Printing Office in 1949.

Here on the first page I will read a few lines:

"The chain of events that produced the area comprising Dinosaur National Monument began in what is known as the Jurassic period of earth history.

"This period, according to the best calculations of geologists, occupied an interval of time from 127 to 152 million years ago."

At another point in this document (the paragraph escapes my eye at the moment), the statement is made that in that ancient period this area was inhabited by the dinosaur and his relatives, who, in time, gave way to more intelligent beings—oh, here is the sentence from page 18:

"There did, however, come a day when the last dinosaur drew his final breath, leaving the world to new, different, and more intelligent creatures."

In the belief that man is to be classified among these more intelligent creatures, I appear before you today to beg of you to use the intelligence of the Congress to maintain the policy which was initiated after this history of over a million years of destruction. Congress was intelligent enough, and the States of the Colorado River Basin under their governments were intelligent enough, to do something about the control of the stream which had wrought so much damage through millions of years, and to use it for a constructive purpose.

As you will see from glancing at the map, the story of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin begins in the State of Wyoming, where the Green River has its rise—the Green River and its tributaries. It flows south past the towns of Green River and

of Rock Springs, through the Flaming Gorge site, into the State of Utah, and then over into the State of Colorado.

Under the compact which was written by the Colorado River Compact Commission, of which former President Hoover was the head, and approved by the Congress of the United States, it was agreed to divide the waters of this stream, the main flow of this stream, the waters of this system, between the upper basin and the lower basin, and the delivery of the waters which the upper basin owed to the lower basin was ordered to be made at this point on the map—at Lee's Ferry.

COMPACT DIVIDED WATER BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER BASINS

The agreement in that compact was that each basin would be entitled to use for consumptive purposes just about half of the stream flow of that system.

The work first began in the lower basin. Of course, before the Colorado River compact was approved there was private irrigation both in the lower and the upper basin, and efforts were made to irrigate and reclaim certain amounts of land. But, according to the testimony of Mr. Northcutt Ely, a representative of California in the sense that he is one of the lawyers representing the California claims, the State of California today is using about 5 million acre-feet plus of water from this system. The lower basin, all of the lower basin, is using about 6½ million acre-feet. The upper basin, Mr. Northcutt Ely acknowledges, presently is using between 2 million and 2½ million acre-feet. We place that use at 2 million, but for the purposes of this argument I accept Mr. Ely's figures.

In his testimony before the Senate committee, he also acknowledged that all of the projects in the upper basin, which have heretofore been authorized but which have not yet been constructed, might add from 400,000 to 500,000 acre-feet to the future uses of the upper basin.

RATIO IS ALMOST 6 TO 4 IN FAVOR OF LOWER BASIN

Let us take the maximum figures mentioned by Mr. Ely, 2½ million acre-feet, his maximum estimate of present use, and 500,000 if authorized projects not yet built were constructed. Thus, according to the estimates of the California expert, we would have 3 million acre-feet. If all the participating projects included in the Senate bill (S. 500) and the Governor Johnson amendments which have been proposed were built, the upper basin use would not exceed 4½ million acre-feet.

The lower basin, on the other hand, has 6½ million acre-feet. Thus, considering present uses, heretofore authorized but unbuilt projects, and projects proposed by this bill, there is a ratio of almost 6 to 4 against the upper basin on the testimony of Mr. Ely, so far as California is concerned. But it is important to remember that Mr. Ely estimates the present uses in the upper basin at a half million acre-feet more than does the Bureau of Reclamation.

We have reason to believe that the lower basin may use even more than acknowledged by Mr. Ely, but the juxtaposition of these figures seems to me must convince every fair mind that nothing should be done or be permitted to be done to prevent the utilization in the upper basin States of the water allocated to it by the Colorado River compact, namely, 7½ million acre-feet annually.

UPPER STATES WANT ONLY THEIR DUE

The upper basin States are willing to be bound by the compact. The bill before you acknowledges that. Every attempt is made to avoid injuring any right, either existing or potential, under the Colorado River compact. We want only to have the opportunity of using the water as it flows through our States, while we deliver at Lee's Ferry,

according to the obligation laid upon us in the Colorado River compact, 7½ million acre-feet, which is 3 million more than is now being used and proposed in the whole upper basin annually.

Now this is the simple picture, but a great effort has been made to convince those who listen to the arguments against the upper basin that this water system is almost a static business. We are asked to overlook the fact that the water moves and that it has been moving down that valley for millions of years. During all of those eons it has wrought only destruction. Man had not captured it, nor harnessed it, nor done anything to make it useful, except in a very small way, until by the authority of Congress the States in the Colorado River Basin were authorized to make a compact to bring these eternally flowing waters under control and to make this system an instrument of construction.

Fortunately for the lower basin, the lower basin States secured Federal legislation to store and divert water long before the upper basin States ever reached an agreement. Finally a percentage was allotted to each of these upper-basin States, and now we are here asking authorization to begin the construction of projects which, in the bill, must be supported by the certification, not only of the Secretary of the Interior, but of the President of the United States, that the projects are feasible.

UPPER STATES HAVE POURED MONEY INTO RECLAMATION FUND

Yet you are asked to believe that this is a project which will place upon the backs of the taxpayers of the United States an intolerable burden.

My colleague, Senator BARRETT, has just shown to you how the State of Wyoming alone, under the Federal Leasing Act, a law passed by the Congress, has been contributing millions of dollars ever since 1920 for the reclamation fund to build reclamation projects most of which, until 20 years ago, were built in other States.

And yet, gentlemen, propagandists have the—well, I should say, effrontery—to scatter broadcast through the Congress of the United States a little pamphlet with a red back and a red front, attempting to tell the people of the country that the upper basin States are not contributing to the cost of this project.

We build power; we have returns from the projects. Of course, it would be impossible to require the farmers on the newly irrigated farms in this area to pay the entire cost. Everybody knew that when the Colorado River compact was drawn and when it was approved. That was known when the Hoover Dam was built and made a power project to develop power and earn revenue.

I wish it were possible to display to you on a screen the pictures of the Colorado River and the lower basin before the Hoover Dam was built and after it was built. I have some photographs here showing the site after completion of the dam. But it is only necessary to refer to the irrigation of the Imperial Valley in California; it is only necessary to refer to the great expansion of the city of Los Angeles; it is only necessary to refer to the development of California industry as a result of the water and the power which was stored in these dams, to prove conclusively that it was a wise and salutary act of Congress to authorize the harnessing of this stream. Surely what was good enough for the lower basin ought to be good enough for the upper basin, too.

ECHO PARK DAM BILL LEAVES DINOSAUR UNDISTURBED

Now, it is said that the Echo Park Reservoir should not be permitted to be built. It is said that Congress ought to preserve the deep canyons which were worn in the terrain of the upper basin by the Green and

the Yampa Rivers during all these centuries past, preserve them as a monument to the dinosaurs, and the public is sought to be convinced that those of us who advocate the construction of this reservoir are flooding out the Dinosaur Monument. It is not so.

In this same monograph of the National Park Service, written by William Lee Stokes, of the United States Geological Survey and the University of Utah in 1949, there is a map of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado, and this map contains a little diagram showing the original Dinosaur National Monument. I would like the members of the committee to see that.

Congressman THOMSON, the original Dinosaur Monument is this almost infinitesimal spot at the extreme western end of the Dinosaur National Monument, as expanded [indicating].

RECLAMATION HAS PRIOR RIGHTS IN AREA

Long before the Dinosaur National Monument was created by the Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson under the authority of the Antiquities Act, long before that, there was a reclamation withdrawal in this area because it was recognized that reclamation was one of the constructive purposes to which water could be put. Here was a stream that had been rushing torrents of wasted water down through an area larger than the whole New England States and part of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Here was this great area through which this river had been tearing and foaming and pouring torrential floods, carrying all sorts of silt and, maybe, mineral resources in its flood, but always digging in and digging in. Here was this river.

Then an attempt was made to store water, store it in the Hoover Dam, with great success. But they tell us, if we store water in the Glen Canyon Dam, that will deprive the lower basin, or at least California, of some of its uses. The words are written into the bill to prevent that.

But the point that I want to make to this committee with respect to these dams is that the only way by which the upper basin States can get the water which was allocated by the authority of the Congress of the United States to the upper basin is to build these dams.

It is said that the minute the Glen Canyon dam is built Hoover dam or Lake Mead will be deprived of its supply. That assumes that to build a dam in the upper reaches of a stream it is necessary to stop the flow of the stream entirely. That is not the way the engineers build dams.

The members of this committee can look at pictures, some of them on the walls of the committee room outside, pictures from the Bureau of Reclamation, which show how the tunnels are dug so that the stream can continue to flow. You cannot build a dam with a flooding back behind it; you have to make the stream flow around the construction work. Otherwise men could not live there very long; they would soon join the dinosaurs of 150 million years ago.

OBJECTIVE IS TO UTILIZE WASTE WATER

The dams at Glen Canyon and at Echo Park are structures that are designed to balance the flow. What the engineers have planned to do is to store the water that goes to waste, the water that is not claimed by the lower basin, the water that the lower basin could not get under the Colorado River Compact, the water that we can use if we have the intelligence to build structures that will save it. And all the time that those dams are being built the upper basin is still under the obligation of the Colorado River Act and of the compact to deliver at Lee's Ferry an average of 7½ million feet annually, or 75 million acre-feet for a 10-year period for the use of the lower basin.

The testimony before the Senate, as I said at the beginning, is, according to Mr. Ely's

figures, that the maximum present use of water in the lower basin, including the use by Arizona, is about 6½ million acre-feet. So we have not reached their full allocation, and we intend only to take the water that is not necessary to meet what they need.

WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT ALWAYS HAD PRIORITY IN MONUMENT AREA

Now then, just a word about the creation of the monument. I wrote to the director of the National Park Service asking him for some pictures of the Dinosaur Monument, where the bones are found. His letter to me reads as follows, being dated December 23, 1954:

"DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In answer to your letter of December 16 requesting photographs of the original 80 acres of Dinosaur National Monument, I am enclosing three 5 by 7 prints of photographs taken in the quarry section, and two copies of a sales pamphlet on the dinosaur fossils which contain illustrations of several scenes in that area.

"We do not have on hand prints of the pictures in the pamphlet, but we can have them made for you if you will let us know which ones you would like and the size print desired.

"Although we cannot furnish the sales pamphlet in quantity, we can furnish you a few extra copies if you need them.

"Sincerely yours."

I wish to pass these photographs around because they prove conclusively that the 80-acre Dinosaur Monument set aside by Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson to preserve the bones of the dinosaurs is not a thing of beauty. It is like any quarry, a bleak and unattractive area.

Now, I want to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, 1954, from a statement made by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in which he set forth in orderly progress the history of the movement by which the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded.

"Official actions since 1902 which established the priority of water and power development in the Green and the Yampa Rivers follow:

"1. October 17, 1904, reclamation withdrawal;

"2. June 8, 1906, act authorizing the creation of national monuments."

I pause here to say parenthetically that that act, the Antiquities Act, authorized the President to set aside by Executive order, areas of historical or scientific value, but it contained a specific proviso that the area should be the smallest possible area to protect the historic site or the scientific area. The Dinosaur Monument was created by Executive order and it embraced only 80 acres.

As long after that as 32 years, the same forces which are now attacking the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin as some sort of a raid upon conservation succeeded in persuading President Roosevelt to issue an Executive order expanding that 80-acre monument of Wilson's by some 209,664 acres.

Where were those acres, Mr. Chairman? They were the acres embracing the confluence of the Yampa and the Green Rivers. There are no dinosaur bones there; there is nothing of scientific value there except the scientific value of flowing water which ought to be used.

So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized

as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States.

I return now to Senator WATKINS' statement:

"October 4, 1915, proclamation establishing the Dinosaur National Monument of 80 acres.

"June 10, 1920, Federal Power Act passed; section 4 giving authority to issue licenses for the erection of dams both within and without a national monument.

"March 3, 1921, the Federal Power Act was amended to prevent the licensing of dams, powerplants, or other works in national parks and monuments without specific authority of Congress."

That is now cited, I say parenthetically, by some of the witnesses against this bill as a congressional disapproval of this act; whereas, upon its face, all that that act does is to say that the Federal Power Commission cannot by executive action alone issue licenses within parks or monuments, but must have the approval of Congress. It was an act which retains for this committee and this Congress the authority to pass the bill which is before you, and the bill which we have before the Senate.

Now I return to Senator WATKINS' statement again:

"This amendment was limited to 'existing' national parks and monuments 'as now constituted'."

So that it was, you see, a limitation bounded by the date of the passage of that act, which was March 3, 1921.

Let me skip now a little bit to August 9, 1934:

"The National Park Service asked the Federal Power Commission to restore its withdrawal for power purposes in the acres in Green and Yampa River Canyons so that a national monument could be established, and stated: 'Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights and a power withdrawal is an existing right.'"

"On December 19, 1934, the Federal Power Commission replied, referring to withdrawals for the Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments, saying, after noting that the Park Service had acknowledged the withdrawal and stated that such rights would be exempted, the Federal Power Commission continues—"this I want to emphasize—I am quoting from the Federal Power Commission—"It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

"Those were the words of the Federal Power Commission on December 13, 1934, when the National Park Service was endeavoring to expand the 80-acre monument by 209,664 acres in order to include the power sites. Who is rating whom?

"Then the Power Commission goes on: 'The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of those streams. The Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of a monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.'"

"Clearly, the story of the expansion of this monument is the story of the attempt of the Federal Power Commission to protect the water resources and the power resources of this area. And then what happened?"

ASSURANCE WAS GIVEN THAT DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT SUFFER

I will skip so that I may not take up too much of your time:

"July 14, 1938," says Senator WATKINS, "after many local meetings were held, at which the people of the area were assured that the proposed expansion would not prevent the development of the water and the power resources, the President of the United States issued a proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument from 80 to 209,744 acres.

"The proclamation provides that this expansion"—this is in the proclamation by President Roosevelt—"this expansion shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended."

Then Senator WATKINS says:

"This proclamation, including the specific reservation, is a pledge to the people of Utah and Colorado that the expansion of the monument would not interfere with the development of their water and power resources. The construction of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument, therefore, cannot be an invasion of the national monument principle, nor establish a precedent that would be applied to other monuments."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this recitation by Senator WATKINS, briefly pointing out each step of the way, is conclusive proof that the passage of this act will create no precedent to injure any national park or national monument, and no power site can be granted thereafter, I think, without the consent of Congress.

MONUMENT TO DESTRUCTION, OR MONUMENT TO GROWTH?

So, Mr. Chairman, the issue before us in the Congress this year is simply whether or not we shall take the intelligent course of allowing the people in the upper Colorado River Basin to have the benefits which were allocated to them by a compact among the basin States and approved by Congress, whether they shall have the right to have the Federal Government do for them what it has already done for the lower basin, by building reservoirs to store the flowing water which otherwise would go to no use at all.

Now in closing—I have talked too long—I merely want to say that the area of the State of Wyoming, which is in this upper basin, is at the very top of the Colorado River system. The waters have been flowing down there through the Green River for ages. The land there needs the water. It can be placed upon the land. It can be placed upon the land by this plan, this comprehensive plan, by engineers who have not yet built any dam anywhere in the United States that has collapsed. The record of the Bureau of Reclamation is perfect upon that point.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say, please, please forget these emotional appeals without basis, and instead of making the upper Colorado River Basin a monument to the destruction of the ages that have gone, let us make it a monument to the growth and expansion and the development of intelligent action, using the discoveries of science and the learning of the colleges and schools we have built by public resources all over the United States, in order to make it easier and of a better standard for people to live.

If we were to follow the course of policy outlined by Gen. U. S. Grant, who testified before us, by Sierra witnesses, by the Wilderness witnesses, we would be turning our back on all that science has developed, and we would be saying, "The people of America may enjoy these great achievements of the century, except in the upper Colorado River Basin." And not there, because of fears entertained, without justification, because of the language in the bill, and because of sentimental and thoughtless appeals by people who do not know that when the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded

the power resources of the area were protected in the President's executive order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with relation to the upper Colorado River project.

I should also like to ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my statement on the project, a resolution presented by Mr. Les Woerpel on behalf of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs and adopted at the 19th Annual Convention of the National Wild Life Federation. This resolution is representative of the many expressions that I have received on this specific issue.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

With respect to the legislation now pending before the Senate, S. 500, I may say it is a source of regret to me that this bill was brought so rapidly to the Senate floor, that, in my judgment, there has not been sufficient opportunity for all of the groups which are deeply interested in it adequately to appraise the committee report.

I do not, of course, question the desire of the leadership to have the Senate proceed expeditiously on its important agenda, although I do say that, in this instance, it is somewhat unfortunate that more time is not available for the most careful evaluation.

I shall not attempt at the present time to make a detailed evaluation of S. 500 on the Senate floor.

I shall only say that I share the deep concern which has been voiced by numerous conservation groups and authorities in our Nation on S. 500, particularly in regard to those provisions which would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument.

I have heard from conservationists in my own State who have questioned the advisability from the standpoint of possible danger to the Nation's outdoor heritage. I note, for example, that among the groups which are officially on record in opposition to it are such outstanding organizations as the Isaac Walton League; the National Parks Association; the Wilderness Society; the Wildlife Management Institute; the National Wild Life Federation, and others.

From another standpoint, I should like to observe that numerous members of the engineering profession are opposed to the bill, including the Engineers Joint Council; the American Society of Civil Engineers; the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; the American Institute of Electrical Engineers; the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers; the American Society for Engineering Education; and the American Institute for Chemical Engineers.

I have always believed that the expert judgment of groups affected by pending legislation should be carefully considered.

I do not believe in weighing, of course, the total number of groups opposed to a given bill, as against the total number of groups which may be in favor of a bill. Of course, it is not mere numbers which should be weighed, but the merits of their arguments. Nevertheless, I point out the above facts as indications of the significant sentiment of two important segments of American society—conservation and engineering—in connection with opposition to the pending bill.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., 19TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MONTREAL, MARCH 11-13, 1955

OPPOSING ECHO PARK DAM

Whereas the National Park System, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being supported and enjoyed by millions of people; and

Whereas progressive losses of recreational facilities in the various States apparently cannot be stopped, and recreational lands increased for the use of all of the people; and

Whereas such continuing loss in the light of increased use of outdoor recreational opportunities makes this condition alarming; and

Whereas any legislation that would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah would open the way for further destruction of other recreational areas in our monuments and parks; and

Whereas the alternatives that have been offered have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proven inferior; and

Whereas the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been fully demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That National Wildlife Federation, in line with its policy of fighting for increased recreational opportunities for all of the people, take every action possible to oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam and to preserve the Dinosaur National Monument as it is now constituted, and to do everything possible to see that our National Park System is not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, and at his request, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Vice President, and at his request, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, speaking in support of S. 500, a bill authorizing initial units of a plan for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, it may be profitable to state the situation existing between the seven States which contain the drainage basin of the Colorado River.

In 1922, after several years of preparatory research and studies of the physical and legal factors, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming, through Commissioners, agreed upon a compact to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of this drainage basin. This compact was to become effective when ratified by the legislatures of the States and approved by the Congress, as required by law. The compact divided the basin into "upper" and "lower" subbasins containing approximately 110,000 and 130,000 square miles, respectively, in the United States. The area of the upper basin is that which drains to the stream above a point 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River. This point is in northern Arizona not far from the Arizona-Utah boundary line, and is called Lee Ferry.

The compact requires that the upper basin States, being Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, together with a portion of Arizona, shall be given the perpetual apportionment of 7½ million acre-feet annually for beneficial consumptive use; that the lower basin States, Arizona, California, and Nevada, be given a like apportionment. However, the upper basin agreed not to deplete the runoff at Lee Ferry, by their combined consumptive use, to a degree which would leave less than 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series. The compact contains other provisions which are not material to this legislation, except that which permitted the States of each of the two basins to agree by compact between them upon divisions of use of the apportionment made in the compact.

The upper basin States, including Arizona, did agree in 1948 upon such apportionments, based upon beneficial consumptive use, and Congress has approved that compact. S. 500 notes these two compacts, the Water Treaty with Mexico, the laws enacted by Congress with respect to them, and clearly requires conformity with each and all of them in the development and operation of reclamation works in the upper basin.

The effect of the Colorado River compact of 1922 is simply to eliminate as between the States of the upper basin and those of the lower basin, the doctrine of priority of water rights. The States of the upper basin since 1922 thus have enjoyed security in their rights to use their apportionments when and where it is to their best interests to do so. It was on such a premise that the upper basin States favored authorization of the construction of Hoover Dam, the All-American Canal to Imperial Valley, the Gila irrigation project, and the Parker and Davis Dams, all in the lower basin.

I am one of the 10 Senators sponsoring S. 500. We represent, in this body, the five States having perpetual water rights to the flows of the Colorado River and its tributaries in the upper basin. We are joined under the terms of the

Upper Colorado River Basin Compact which was ratified by these States, and approved by the Congress, for the specific purpose of securing the development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

The bill under consideration is to initiate the fulfillment of that purpose. It is, in fact, a measure proposed by the Upper Colorado River Commission which was created by the compact. The Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, is to be authorized as the construction agency.

Under the provisions of the bill, water rights will vest in the lands to be irrigated and in the municipalities to be supplied with domestic and industrial water supply, all in conformity with the laws of the States and the Federal reclamation laws.

While the works will be financed and constructed by the Federal Government, the people directly benefited will pay for them. The expenditures for power and municipal water supplies will be returned with interest, including interest during construction.

As amended by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and approved by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, S. 500 would authorize the construction of five "holdover storage" reservoirs. These reservoirs will make possible releases of water to the Lower Colorado River Basin so that upstream uses of water can be made during periods of low flows, while the upper basin States, at the same time, fulfill their compact commitments to the lower basin. Hydroelectric power will be generated from the release of stored water. The need of power is marked throughout the seven Colorado River Basin States.

The function of these storage units is of vital importance to all 7 of the Colorado River Basin States and of particular importance to the upper basin States. From the functional point of view, they are of significance to each of the upper basin States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming because, without them, in the light of historical flows of the Colorado River, those States cannot hope eventually to make the uses of water that are apportioned to them as a group by the Colorado River compact of 1922 and among them by the upper Colorado River Basin compact. They are also of financial significance to each of the upper division States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, because the revenues from the power they produce will help to pay the costs of irrigation works that can be undertaken in each of those States. These storage units are extremely important to the States of the lower basin because they retain sediments which otherwise will finally impair the functions of existing storage at Hoover Dam.

In approximately 50 years from the date of their construction, these storage units will have returned their total cost. In addition to that, they will have returned 2½ percent interest per annum on that part of their costs which is allocated to power, together with interest during construction.

One of these holdover storage units is located in the Dinosaur National Monument. The Senate has received much information on this subject during the past year. Suffice it to say that when the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged to take in the Echo Park area, the people of the States of Colorado and Utah, living in the vicinity, were assured that such enlargement would not prohibit use of the area for water storage purposes.

Good faith requires us not to bar the use of the area for those purposes. Every effort has been made to find an equally good reservoir site outside the area of the monument. None has been found. None can be found which combines all of the attributes of Echo Park.

Echo Park Dam can be authorized without, in any sense, setting a precedent that might endanger other national monuments or national parks. The reason is that the circumstances surrounding the enlargement of the Dinosaur National Monument are unique in that there was a reservation for power and storage development.

The question whether the Echo Park Dam should be authorized has become, in large part, a matter of emotion rather than reason.

The experts testified before our committee with clarity and precision that no equivalent for Echo Park can be found. Others testified that they were opposed to Echo Park, not so much because of their love for the Dinosaur National Monument—many of them had never been there—but because of their love of nature and their desire to preserve it for posterity. I am certain many of my colleagues in the Senate have received numerous letters from these good people. Many of those letters were obviously written by persons who had been asked to write, and who were glad to do so; but they have no real knowledge or sympathetic understanding of the needs of our arid country for economical storage sites.

S. 500 authorizes a number of participating irrigation projects, and it is contemplated that others will be authorized in the future. These irrigation projects are called participating projects because they will participate in power revenues to aid in meeting their construction costs.

These projects authorized in the bill total 383,000 acres. To take this amount of acreage and to charge against it the entire cost allocated to irrigation, including holdover storage costs so allocated, when it is contemplated that other projects will be authorized containing an amount of acreage which cannot be accurately stated at this time, is obviously a grossly inaccurate and misleading method of estimating the irrigation costs on an acreage basis.

Even though the few participating projects contained in S. 500 constitute only a beginning on irrigation development in the upper basin, the bill contains a number of safeguards that are designed to prevent initiation of construction of works which require further economic analysis. Notwithstanding the many years of investigation which have pre-

ceded the bill, our committee concluded that it would follow, in the main, the recommendations made by the present administration in connection with such safeguards. Thus, under the terms of the bill, as amended, construction of participating projects may not be initiated until there has been a reevaluation of the relation of their anticipated benefits to their estimated costs, and consultation thereon with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Furthermore, the participating projects could not be started prior to the completion of soil surveys and land classifications in accordance with the requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954. No participating project can be commenced until the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied that its costs will be paid out in 50 years.

One of the unique aspects of the bill, as amended in our subcommittee, consists in its financial provisions. The total reimbursable costs of the holdover storage reservoirs will be returned within 50 years from the commencement of their operation. Costs of participating projects are returnable within 50 years from the date of their completion; and this includes both those costs that are returnable by the water users as well as the costs returnable from power revenues.

The bill is so drawn as to require the separate treatment of interest returned on the power and municipal water supply investments, and to assure that such interest revenues will not be credited as payments on account of principal. These financial provisions, which were recommended to us by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior, are more strict than the requirements of existing reclamation law.

In effect, these provisions of S. 500 constitute a financial arrangement between the Federal Government and the five upper basin States for the return of all costs of the project except those costs that are directly related to national benefits. Only 3 percent of the total cost of the project is nonreimbursable.

Under the very strict provisions of S. 500, as I have already pointed out, the interest returned on power and municipal water supply cannot be credited as payment on account of principal. Under S. 500, the rate of interest is determined by following detailed and specific provisions for computing the average rate prevailing for long-term Treasury obligations.

The rate of interest is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the formula provided in the bill. S. 500, as the committee has amended it, provides for 50-year repayment contracts, in which the irrigation water users are to repay their share of the costs. They may, where particular circumstances warrant, have a development period not exceeding 10 years.

One of the outstanding provisions of S. 500 is the requirement that, in every case where such a course is practicable, the organization entering into the repayment contract—to repay to the United States the irrigation costs of participat-

ing projects—shall be of the “conservancy” district type.

Conservancy districts normally include within their territorial limits not only the agricultural area receiving the irrigation water supply but also the contiguous urban areas. Conservancy districts have the power to levy ad valorem taxes. Thus, the burden of repayment is spread, as it should be, among all local beneficiaries of the project as well as among the irrigation farmers.

Since the participating projects authorized by S. 500 constitute only a beginning on the irrigation development that must eventually take place in the upper Colorado River basin, the bill lays down policies designed to encourage continued investigations, the preparation of additional reports, feasibility studies, and the possible authorization of new participating projects from time to time.

Our committee had before it the question whether pending litigation between Arizona and California, which raises a number of questions of interpretation of compacts, treaties, and laws affecting the Colorado River, is of such a character as to require delay in the authorization of the Colorado River storage project. We concluded that it is not of such a character and that the authorization of these works should not be delayed. However, we have afforded the fullest measure of protection to the lower basin States by providing barriers against the operation of any of such works in a manner contrary to the applicable compacts, treaties, and laws.

We have accomplished this in two principal ways. First, by specific direction that the Secretary of the Interior shall operate such works in accordance with such compacts, treaties, and laws; and, secondly, by waiver of the immunity of the United States from suit, so that any State which considers that such works are being or may be operated in a manner contrary to such compacts, treaties, and laws, may have redress in the Supreme Court without delay.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that the upper Colorado River Basin States have been waiting for more than a quarter of a century for the works which will be authorized if S. 500 becomes law. The investigations furnishing the solid foundation of knowledge upon which these States, working with the Federal Government, have been able to build a plan, on which we are now asked to act, have proceeded for more than 25 years. These investigations have been carried out by experts in the field. All possible reservoir sites have been looked into. Many sites have been drilled; so it is known what conditions the builders will run into. Irrigation needs have been examined. Domestic water needs for the long pull have been computed. Power markets have been thoroughly surveyed. The result of all these investigations is a plan, a part of which would be authorized by S. 500.

The total cost of the project, assuming the construction of everything which is authorized, will be \$1,093,000,000. This seems like a large figure. However, it should be remembered that this amount will be divided among 5 States over a 25-

year construction period. Looked at in that way, the project involves an average expenditure of only \$9 million per annum for each State. We should remember that almost all of it will be paid back, much of it with interest, and that, after such repayment has been accomplished, the taxpayers will realize an income up to \$20 million a year from power revenue alone, for many, many years to come.

I wish that those of my colleagues who have not done so would view some of the irrigated areas in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Here are farm upon farm where once the desert reigned. Here are homes where once there was no shelter. Here are prosperous communities, schools, and churches. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to know that those projects which have been built in the West pay for themselves many times over in income taxes alone.

The bill authorizes construction of 6 reservoirs, of which 5 provide hold-over storage capacity. These reservoirs, together, will regulate the runoff for better river control in the whole Colorado River Basin. Lake Mead will require a lesser reservation for flood control, thereby having a greater active holdover capacity. The average annual silt inflow to Lake Mead is about 105,000 acre-feet. Of this quantity nearly 80,000 acre-feet, or 75 percent, will be captured in Glen Canyon Reservoir. The benefits of the storage project to the lower basin States will, therefore, be of considerable magnitude.

In the Colorado River storage project, for which we now seek authorization, there will be installed 1,200,000 kilowatts for power generation, and the energy produced will be 6 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

This is what now is proposed by Federal projects in the lower Colorado River Basin. Authorized Federal hydroelectric plants in the Missouri Basin on the main river in Montana and the Dakotas will generate 10 billion kilowatt-hours annually. Constructed Federal plants in the Columbia Basin produce more than 36 billion kilowatt-hours annually, and authorized plants will produce an additional 26 billion kilowatts annually. At present, there is but one Federal hydropower plant in the upper Colorado Basin, and that is at Green Mountain Dam in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

The information submitted to us shows: That the average annual evaporation losses in the reservoirs authorized by the bill will be 754,000 acre-feet; that consumptive uses on the participating irrigation projects will average 413,000 acre-feet annually; that consumptive uses of existing and uncompleted projects will average 2,500,000. The total consumptive use and stream flow depletion will be the sum of these values, or 3,667,000 acre-feet annually. This is less than one-half of the waters allocated to the States in the upper basin.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair.) Does the

Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I noted that the Senator from Colorado, in speaking about the repayments, stated that we should remember that almost all the money expended will be paid back, much of it with interest. As a matter of fact, all of the items, except that part of the cost which will be allocated to irrigation, will be paid back with interest. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. Interest is not paid on irrigation costs. It has been the law for 50 years that it should not be.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator refers to the basic reclamation law which was enacted in 1902, does he not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The law deals also with flood control, and the program was adopted by the Congress many years ago. The law does not require any of the individuals, corporations, or others who are benefited to pay back any interest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Either interest or principal.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator. I think he has made a very able presentation of the outline of a great project.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, since World War I and the preparations of the United States and our Allies in that conflict, World War II, and the conflict in Korea, this Nation has made heavy drafts upon its natural resources and productive energies. This has been measured in a sense by the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Obviously, our wealth-producing resources and energies spent in war, and in preparation for it, should be replaced or we will have indeed weakened ourselves in many tragic ways, which will reflect themselves most harmfully in our economy for a long time to come.

When we consider the expenditures contemplated by the project now under consideration, figured on a yearly and State-by-State basis, which in the end will pay for themselves and provide a constant replenishment of lost wealth in other directions, we can see that the expenditures here suggested are liberating and wealth-producing factors and are clearly in the interest of the national welfare.

We are simply preparing the seed beds and planting the seeds for a renewal and extension of activities which will help in overcoming the losses to which I have referred; by helping to restore the strength of our productive economy. This is consistent with good policies and in furtherance of good husbandry in the management of our national affairs.

Those of us who live under water conservation projects which irrigate arid lands and which develop power, can see every day the direct and indirect benefits of incalculable size resulting from those projects.

If I may mention my own State, I can say that wherever we have operating water projects, we have prosperity among individuals in the communities affected.

If it were not for its water projects which help to produce a more rounded economy, the State of Colorado would be a State of scattered grazing activities, and it would be sending to the Treasury of the United States only a small fraction of the income taxes and other revenues which now amount to about $\frac{3}{4}$ billion dollars annually.

The proposed reservoirs for water conservation, river regulation, power production, and the participating areas for watering arid lands, will be wealth-producing assets which will go far beyond the immediate benefits to those in position to share them.

Communities will be founded and expanded under the operation of those projects. They will help in the production of local and national tax revenues. There will be cumulative and expanding cycles of productive wealth and prosperity for the benefit of the United States and of the States involved.

When we divide the total cost of these projects by the States benefiting and the period of time necessary to complete the work to be done, remembering again the greater part of the expenditures will be repaid, I suggest that we are paying a very small price for the creation of assets which will replenish many of the productive assets which were lost in the wars and emergencies during the past 40 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, it is with very real regret that I feel compelled to oppose the passage of the pending proposed legislation, S. 500. It is a bill, Madam President, which, in my judgment, is wrong. It violates, and it seriously violates, the precedents of the Congress. Beyond that, it places in very real jeopardy the rights to water of the State of California.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate mine has been a record, I hope I may say, Madam President, of cooperation. I dislike obstruction and obstructionists.

As a United States Senator from the State of California, I am interested in progress for all sections of the United States, mine included. I wish to see the economy and the development of the people and the area of the United States dynamic, and I wish to see the Federal Government do what should be done in playing its part in the development of the Nation.

Nevertheless, Madam President, I feel constrained to oppose the pending bill. I shall endeavor to demonstrate for the RECORD why I oppose the bill and the reasons which have prompted me to bring my opposition to the attention of both the Senate and the country. That will require the devotion of a few moments to the history of the Colorado River.

Madam President, over three-quarters of a century ago—in the 1870's—people in the lower areas of California began to utilize the waters of the Colorado River, by way of irrigating their lands. As the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent continued to develop, and as her population increased, more and more water from the Colorado River was utilized. Under the laws of my State, people and public districts began to ac-

quire rights to that water. I think it is generally conceded that the history of the Colorado River is one of being an erratic stream; at times there have been floods, and at other times there has been virtually no water at all in the river.

As the population of California began to develop with great rapidity, the people of my State believed that it would be in the public interest to have dams constructed for the storage of the water, not alone to regulate the flow of the river, but also to provide for necessary hydroelectric power and orderly development and beneficial use of the waters of the stream.

It was in 1922 that the United States Supreme Court had an important question before it. The State of Wyoming had sued the State of Colorado with respect to the rights in the Colorado River, running through both States. The United States Supreme Court held that "first in time was first in right," and that whoever appropriated first—whether it be in the upper stretches of the stream or in the lower stretches—was protected to the extent that the appropriation could ripen into a legal right. That gave rise to considerable apprehension on the part of the good people in the States of the upper basin of the Colorado River. Here was a State—California—whose population was growing by leaps and bounds, and was operating under a Supreme Court decision which said, "If you use it first, you have a right to it."

So, Madam President, when California, as represented on the floor of the Senate by those who then had been elected from my State, including the late and illustrious Hiram W. Johnson, urged Congress to pass measures providing for the erection of a multiple purpose dam and reservoir in the lower basin, in complete good faith the Senators who represented the States of the upper basin of the Colorado River raised some questions.

One of them was based on their desire to have a compact, agreement, or understanding among all the States of the Colorado River Basin, so that the rule laid down by the Supreme Court would not operate to the detriment of the upper basin States. The representatives of those States said, "Let us enter into an agreement with respect to the waters of the Colorado River. Let us substitute some other rule than 'first in time, first in right'; let us agree how to apportion the waters; and then we shall talk with you about Federal assistance in the development of dams and reservoirs."

There, Madam President, is the genesis of what is now the Colorado River compact. In any discussion of the water rights on that river—and, indeed, in any discussion as to what Congress and the Federal Government should do regarding the Colorado River Basin—it is necessary to refer to the Colorado River compact. That I propose now very briefly to do.

Madam President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Colorado River compact set forth in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the compact was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No. 6225—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come,
Greeting:

I certify that the document annexed is a true copy of the "Colorado River compact," signed 24th November 1922, at the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., the original of which is on file in this Department.

In testimony whereof I, Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Chief Clerk of the said Department, at the city of Washington, this 22nd day of December 1922.

CHARLES E. HUGHES,

Secretary of State.

By BEN B. DAVIS,

Chief Clerk,

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

The States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, having resolved to enter into a compact under the act of the Congress of the United States of America approved August 19, 1921 (42 Statutes at Large, p. 171), and the acts of the legislatures of the said States, have through their governors appointed as their commissioners: W. S. Norviel for the State of Arizona, W. F. McClure for the State of California, Delph E. Carpenter for the State of Colorado, J. G. Scrugham for the State of Nevada, Stephen B. Davis, Jr., for the State of New Mexico, R. E. Caldwell for the State of Utah, Frank C. Emerson for the State of Wyoming, who, after negotiations participated in by Herbert Hoover appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies, and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact—

(a) The term "Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the lower division" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "upper basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "lower basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California,

Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

ARTICLE III

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River System, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

(f) Further equitable apportionment of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Colorado River system unapportioned by paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), may be made in the manner provided in paragraph (g) at any time after October 1, 1963, if and when either basin shall have reached its total beneficial consumptive use as set out in paragraphs (a) and (b).

(g) In the event of a desire for a further apportionment as provided in paragraph (f) any two signatory States, acting through their governors, may give joint notice of such desire to the governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and it shall be the duty of the governors of the signatory States and of the President of the United States of America forthwith to appoint representatives, whose duty it shall be to divide and apportion equitably between the upper basin and lower basin the beneficial use of the unapportioned water of the Colorado River system as mentioned in paragraph (f), subject to the legislative ratification of the signatory States and the Congress of the United States of America.

ARTICLE IV

(a) Inasmuch as the Colorado River has ceased to be navigable for commerce and the reservation of its waters for navigation would seriously limit the development of its basin, the use of its waters for purposes of navigation shall be subservient to the uses

of such water for domestic, agricultural, and power purposes. If the Congress shall not consent to this paragraph, the other provisions of this compact shall nevertheless remain binding.

(b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

(c) The provisions of this article shall not apply to or interfere with the regulation and control by any State within its boundaries of the appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

ARTICLE V

The chief official of each signatory State charged with the administration of water rights, together with the Director of the United States Reclamation Service and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio:

(a) To promote the systematic determination and coordination of the facts as to flow, appropriation, consumption, and use of water in the Colorado River Basin, and the interchange of available information in such matters.

(b) To secure the ascertainment and publication of the annual flow of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry.

(c) To perform such other duties as may be assigned by mutual consent of the signatories from time to time.

ARTICLE VI

Should any claim or controversy arise between any two or more of the signatory States:

(a) with respect to the waters of the Colorado River system not covered by the terms of this compact;

(b) over the meaning or performance of any of the terms of this compact;

(c) as to the allocation of the burdens incident to the performance of any article of this compact or the delivery of waters as herein provided;

(d) as to the construction or operation of works within the Colorado River Basin to be situated in two or more States, or to be constructed in one State for the benefit of another State; or

(e) as to the diversion of water in one State for the benefit of another State; the governors of the States affected, upon the request of one of them, shall forthwith appoint commissioners with power to consider and adjust such claim or controversy, subject to ratification by the legislatures of the States so affected.

Nothing herein contained shall prevent the adjustment of any such claim or controversy by any present method or by direct future legislative action of the interested States.

ARTICLE VII

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

ARTICLE VIII

Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unimpaired by this compact. Whenever storage capacity of 5 million acre-feet shall have been provided on the main Colorado River within or for the benefit of the lower basin, then claims of such rights, if any, by appropriators or users of water in the lower basin against appropriators or users of water in the upper basin shall attach to and be satisfied from water that may be stored not in conflict with article III.

All other rights to beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system shall be satis-

fied solely from the water apportioned to that basin in which they are situate.

ARTICLE IX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

ARTICLE X

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XI

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and by the Congress of the United States. Notice of approval by the legislatures shall be given by the governor of each signatory State to the governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the governors of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have signed this compact in a single original, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., this 24th day of November A. D. 1922.

W. S. NORVIEL.
W. F. MCCLURE.
DELPH E. CARPENTER.
J. G. SCRUGHAM.
STEPHEN B. DAVIS, Jr.
R. E. CALDWELL.
FRANK C. EMERSON.

Approved:

HERBERT HOOVER.

APPENDIX 231—THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT
(Text of the upper Colorado River Basin compact entered into by the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., October 11, 1948)

The State of Arizona, the State of Colorado, the State of New Mexico, the State of Utah, and the State of Wyoming, acting through their commissioners, Charles A. Carson for the State of Arizona, Clifford H. Stone for the State of Colorado, Fred E. Wilson for the State of New Mexico, Edward H. Watson for the State of Utah, and L. C. Bishop for the State of Wyoming, after negotiations participated in by Harry W. Bashore, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, to determine the rights and obligations of each signatory State respecting the uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River, as follows:

ARTICLE I

(a) The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system, the use of which was apportioned in perpetuity to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact; to establish the obligations of each State of the upper division with respect to the deliveries of water required to be made at Lee Ferry by the Colorado River compact; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the upper basin, the storage of water, and to protect life and property from floods.

(b) It is recognized that the Colorado River compact is in full force and effect and all of the provisions hereof are subject thereto.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact:

(a) The term "Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the lower division" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

(e) The term "Lee Ferry" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River one mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "upper basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "lower basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "Colorado River compact" means the agreement concerning the apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system dated November 24, 1922, executed by commissioners for the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, approved by Herbert Hoover, representative of the United States of America, and proclaimed effective by the President of the United States of America, June 25, 1929.

(i) The term "upper Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

(j) the term "Commission" means the administrative agency created by article VIII of this compact.

(k) The term "water year" means that period of 12 months ending September 30 of each year.

(l) The term "acre-foot" means the quantity of water required to cover an acre to the depth of 1 foot and is equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet.

(m) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

(n) The term "virgin flow" means the flow of any stream undepleted by the activities of man.

ARTICLE III

(a) Subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the Colorado River compact and in this compact, there is hereby apportioned from the Upper Colorado River system in perpetuity to the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use of water as follows:

1. To the State of Arizona the consumptive use of 50,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

2. To the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the con-

sumptive use per annum of the quantities resulting from the application of the following percentages to the total quantity of consumptive use per annum apportioned in perpetuity to and available for use each year by upper basin [sic] under the Colorado River compact and remaining after the deduction of the use, not to exceed 50,000 acre-feet per annum, made in the State of Arizona.

State of Colorado, 51.75 percent.

State of New Mexico, 11.25 percent.

State of Utah, 23 percent.

State of Wyoming, 14 percent.

(b) The apportionment made to the respective States by paragraph (a) of this article is based upon, and shall be applied in conformity with, the following principles and each of them.

1. The apportionment is of any and all man-made depletions;

2. Beneficial use is the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right to use;

3. No State shall exceed its apportioned use in any water year when the effect of such excess use, as determined by the Commission, is to deprive another signatory State of its apportioned use during that water year: *Provided*, That this subparagraph (b) (3) shall not be construed as—

(i) Altering the apportionment of use, or obligations to make deliveries as provided in articles XI, XII, XIII, or XIV of this compact;

(ii) Purporting to apportion among the signatory States such uses of water as the upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River compact; or

(iii) Countenancing average uses by any signatory State in excess of its apportionment.

4. The apportionment to each State includes all water necessary for the supply of any rights which now exist.

(c) No apportionment is hereby made, or intended to be made, of such uses of water as the upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River compact.

(d) The apportionment made by this article shall not be taken as any basis for the allocation among the signatory States of any benefits resulting from the generation of power.

ARTICLE IV

In the event curtailment of use of water by the States of the upper division at any time shall become necessary in order that the flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River compact, the extent of curtailment by each State of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be in such quantities and at such times as shall be determined by the Commission upon the application of the following principles:

(a) The extent and times of curtailment shall be such as to assure full compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact;

(b) If any State or States of the upper division, in the 10 years immediately preceding the water year in which curtailment is necessary, shall have consumptively used more water than it was or they were, as the case may be, entitled to use under the apportionment made by article III of this compact, such State or States shall be required to supply at Lee Ferry a quantity of water equal to its, or the aggregate of their, overdraft, or the proportionate part of such overdraft, as may be necessary to assure compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact, before demand is made on any other State of the upper division;

(c) Except as provided in subparagraph (b) of this article, the extent of curtailment by each State of the upper division of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be such

as to result in the delivery at Lee Ferry of a quantity of water which bears the same relation to the total required curtailment of use by the States of the upper division as the consumptive use of the upper Colorado River system water which was made by each State during the water year immediately preceding the year in which the curtailment becomes necessary bears to the total consumptive use of such water in the States of the upper division during the same water year; provided, that in determining such relation the uses of water under rights perfected prior to November 24, 1922, shall be excluded.

ARTICLE V

(a) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed prior to the signing of this compact shall be charged to the State in which such reservoir or reservoirs are located. Water stored in reservoirs covered by this paragraph (a) shall be for the exclusive use of and shall be charged to the State in which the reservoir or reservoirs are located.

(b) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed after the signing of this compact shall be charged as follows:

1. If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to assist the States of the upper division in meeting their obligations to deliver water at Lee Ferry imposed by article III of the Colorado River compact, the Commission shall make findings, which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir capacity allocated for that purpose. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall be charged to the States of the upper division in the proportion which the consumptive use of water in each State of the upper division during the water year in which the charge is made bears to the total consumptive use of water in all States of the upper division during the same water year. Water stored in reservoirs or in reservoir capacity covered by this subparagraph (b) (1) shall be for the common benefit of all of the States of the upper division.

2. If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to supply water for use in a State of the upper division, the Commission shall make findings which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to supply water for use and the State in which such water will be used. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the State in which such water will be used shall be borne by that State. As determined by the Commission, water stored in reservoirs covered by this subparagraph (b) (2) shall be earmarked for and charged to the State in which the water will be used.

(c) In the event the Commission finds that a reservoir site is available both to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry and to store water for consumptive use in a State of the upper division, the storage of water for consumptive use shall be given preference. Any reservoir or reservoir capacity hereafter used to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall by order of the Commission be used to store water for consumptive use in a State, provided the Commission finds that such storage is reasonably necessary to permit such State to make the use of the water apportioned to it by this compact.

ARTICLE VI

The Commission shall determine the quantity of the consumptive use of water, which use is apportioned by article III here-

of, for the upper basin and for each State of the upper basin by the inflow-outflow method in terms of manmade depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry, unless the Commission, by unanimous action, shall adopt a different method of determination.

ARTICLE VII

The consumptive use of water by the United States of America or any of its agencies, instrumentalities, or wards shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That such consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

ARTICLE VIII

(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. The Commission shall be composed of one Commissioner representing each of the States of the upper division, namely, the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, designated or appointed in accordance with the laws of each such State, and if designated by the President, one Commissioner representing the United States of America. The President is hereby requested to designate a Commissioner. If so designated the Commissioner representing the United States of America shall be the presiding officer of the Commission and shall be entitled to the same powers and rights as the Commissioner of any State. Any four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(b) The salaries and personal expenses of each Commissioner shall be paid by the Government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the Commission incident to the administration of this compact, and which are not paid by the United States of America, shall be borne by the four States according to the percentage of consumptive use apportioned to each. On or before December 1 of each year, the Commission shall adopt and transmit to the governors of the four States and to the President a budget covering an estimate of its expenses for the following year, and of the amount payable by each State. Each State shall pay the amount due by it to the Commission on or before April 1 of the year following. The payment of the expenses of the Commission and of its employees shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of any of the four States; however, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified independent public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the Commission, or an employee of any signatory State or of the United States of America while so acting. He shall serve for such terms and receive such salary and perform such duties as the Commission may direct. The Commission may employ such engineering, legal, clerical, and other personnel as, in its judgment, may be necessary for the performance of its functions under this compact. In the hiring of employees, the Commission shall not be bound by the civil service laws of any State.

(d) The Commission, so far as consistent with this compact, shall have the power to:

1. Adopt rules and regulations.
2. Locate, establish, construct, abandon, operate and maintain water gaging stations.
3. Make estimates to forecast water runoff on the Colorado River and any of its tributaries.
4. Engage in cooperative studies of water supplies of the Colorado River and its tributaries.
5. Collect, analyze, correlate, preserve, and report on data as to the stream flows, storage,

diversions and use of the waters of the Colorado River, and any of its tributaries.

6. Make findings as to the quantity of water of the upper Colorado River system used each year in the upper Colorado River Basin and in each State thereof.

7. Make findings as to the quantity of water deliveries at Lee Ferry during each water year.

8. Make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use, required, if any, pursuant to reservoir losses and as to the share thereof chargeable under article V hereof to each of the States.

10. Make findings of fact in the event of the occurrence of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the upper basin, whereby deliveries by the upper basin of water which it may be required to deliver in order to aid in fulfilling obligations of the United States of America to the United Mexican States arising under the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, dated February 3, 1944 (treaty series 994) become difficult, and report such findings to the governors of the upper basin States, the President of the United States of America, the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and such other Federal officials and agencies as it may deem appropriate to the end that the water allotted to Mexico under division III of such treaty may be reduced in accordance with the terms of such treaty.

11. Acquire and hold such personal and real property as may be necessary for the performance of its duties hereunder and to dispose of the same when no longer required.

12. Perform all functions required of it by this compact and do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, either independently or in cooperation with any State or Federal agency.

13. Make and transmit annually to the governors of the signatory States and the President of the United States of America, with the estimated budget, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding water year.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this compact the concurrence of four members of the Commission shall be required in any action taken by it.

(f) The Commission and its secretary shall make available to the governor of each of the signatory States any information within its possession at any time, and shall always provide free access to its records by the governors of each of the States, or their representatives, or authorized representatives of the United States of America.

(g) Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal, but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

(h) The organization meeting of the Commission shall be held within 4 months from the effective date of this compact.

ARTICLE IX

(a) No State shall deny the right of the United States of America and, subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, no State shall deny the right of another signatory State, any person, or entity of any signatory State to acquire rights to the use of water, or to construct or participate in the construction and use of diversion works and storage reservoirs with appurtenant works, canals, and conduits in one State for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, regulation, and releasing water to satisfy the provisions of the Colorado River compact relating to the obligation of the States of the upper division to make deliveries of water at Lee Ferry, or for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, or regulating water in an upper signatory State for con-

sumptive use in a lower signatory State, when such use is within the apportionment to such lower State made by this compact. Such rights shall be subject to the rights of water users, in a State in which such reservoir or works are located, to receive and use water, the use of which is within the apportionment to such State by this compact.

(b) Any signatory State, any person or any entity of any signatory State shall have the right to acquire such property rights as are necessary to the use of water in conformity with this compact in any other signatory State by donation, purchase, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain. Any signatory State, upon the written request of the governor of any other signatory State, for the benefit of whose water users property is to be acquired in the State to which such written request is made, shall proceed expeditiously to acquire the desired property either by purchase at a price satisfactory to the requesting State, or, if such purchase cannot be made, then through the exercise of its power of eminent domain and shall convey such property to the requesting State or such entity as may be designated by the requesting State: *Provided*, That all costs of acquisition and expense of every kind and nature whatsoever incurred in obtaining the requested property shall be paid by the requesting State at the time and in the manner prescribed by the State requested to acquire the property.

(c) Should any facility be constructed in a signatory State by and for the benefit of another signatory State or States or the water users thereof, as above provided, the construction, repair, replacement, maintenance, and operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facility is located, except that, in the case of a reservoir constructed in one State for the benefit of another State or States, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located shall permit the storage and release of any water which, as determined by findings of the Commission, falls within the apportionment of the State or States for whose benefit the facility is constructed. In the case of a regulating reservoir for the joint benefit of all States in making Lee Ferry deliveries, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located, in permitting the storage and release of water, shall comply with the findings and orders of the Commission.

(d) In the event property is acquired by a signatory State in another signatory State for the use and benefit of the former, the users of water made available by such facilities, as a condition precedent to the use thereof, shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes levied and assessed against the land and improvements thereon during the 10 years preceding the acquisition of such land. Said payments shall be in full reimbursement for the loss of taxes in such political subdivisions of the State, and in lieu of any and all taxes on said property, improvements and rights. The signatory States recommend to the President and the Congress that, in the event the United States of America shall acquire property in one of the signatory States for the benefit of another signatory State, or its water users, provision be made for like payment in reimbursement of loss of taxes.

ARTICLE X

(a) The signatory States recognize La Plata River compact [sic] entered into between the States of Colorado and New Mexico, dated November 27, 1922, approved by the Congress on January 29, 1925 (43 Stat.

796), and this compact shall not affect the apportionment therein made.

(b) All consumptive use of water of La Plata River and its tributaries shall be charged under apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XI

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the water of the Little Snake River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Wyoming in such quantities as shall result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

(a) Water used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

(1) Water diverted from any tributary of the Little Snake River or from the main stem of the Little Snake River above a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered without regard to rights covering the diversion of water from any downstream points.

(2) Water diverted from the main stem of the Little Snake River below a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered on the basis of an interstate priority schedule prepared by the Commission in conformity with priority dates established by the laws of the respective States.

(b) Water used under rights initiated subsequent to the signing of this compact.

(1) Direct flow diversions shall be so administered that, in time of shortage, the curtailment of use on each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both the States.

(2) The storage of water by projects located in either State, whether of supplemental supply or of water used to irrigate land not irrigated at the date of the signing of this compact, shall be so administered that in time of water shortage the curtailment of storage of water available for each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both States.

(c) Water uses the apportionment made by this article shall be in accordance with the principle that beneficial use shall be the basis, measure, and limit of the right to use.

(d) The States of Colorado and Wyoming each assent to diversions and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

(e) In the event of the importation of water to the Little Snake River Basin from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement, made by the representatives of the States of Colorado and Wyoming on the Commission, it is otherwise provided.

(f) Water use projects initiated after the signing of this compact, to the greatest extent possible, shall permit the full use within the basin in the most feasible manner of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries, without regard to the State line, and, so far as is practicable, shall result in an equal division between the States of the use of water not used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

(g) All consumptive use of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XII

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of Henry's Fork, a tributary of Green River originating in the State of Utah and flowing into the State of Wyoming and thence into the Green River in the State of Utah; Beaver Creek, originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Burnt Fork, a tributary of Henry's Fork originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Birch Creek, a tributary of Henry's Fork originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; and Sheep Creek, a tributary of Green River in the State of Utah, and their tributaries, are hereby apportioned between the States of Utah and Wyoming in such quantities as will result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

(a) Waters used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

Waters diverted from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, shall be administered without regard to the State line on the basis of an interstate priority schedule to be prepared by the States affected and approved by the Commission in conformity with the actual priority of right of use, the water requirements of the land irrigated and the acreage irrigated in connection therewith.

(b) Waters used under rights from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, initiated after the signing of this compact, shall be divided 50 percent to the State of Wyoming and 50 percent to the State of Utah and each State may use said waters as and where it deems advisable.

(c) The State of Wyoming assents to the exclusive use by the State of Utah of the water of Sheep Creek, except that the lands, if any, presently irrigated in the State of Wyoming from the water of Sheep Creek shall be supplied with water from Sheep Creek in order of priority and in such quantities as are in conformity with the laws of the State of Utah.

(d) In the event of the importation of water to Henry's Fork, or any of its tributaries, from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement made by the representatives of the States of Utah and Wyoming on the Commission it is otherwise provided.

(e) All consumptive use of waters of Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, Sheep Creek, and their tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

(f) The States of Utah and Wyoming each assent to the diversion and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact. It shall be the duty of water administrative officials of the State where the water is stored to release said stored water to the other State upon demand. If either the State of Utah or the State of Wyoming shall construct a reservoir in the other State for use in its own State, the water users of the State in which said facilities are constructed may purchase at cost a portion of the capacity of said reservoir sufficient for the irrigation of their lands thereunder.

(g) In order to measure the flow of water diverted, each State shall cause suitable measuring devices to be constructed, maintained, and operated at or near the point of diversion into each ditch.

(h) The State engineers of the two States jointly shall appoint a special water commissioner who shall have authority to administer the water in both States in accordance with the terms of this article. The salary and expenses of such special water commissioner shall be paid, 30 percent by the State of Utah and 70 percent by the State of Wyoming.

ARTICLE XIII

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the rights to the consumptive use of the water of the Yampa River, a tributary entering the Green River in the State of Colorado, are hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Utah in accordance with the following principles:

(a) The State of Colorado will not cause the flow of the Yampa River at the Maybell Gaging Station to be depleted below an aggregate of 5 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification and approval of this compact. In the event any diversion is made from the Yampa River or from tributaries entering the Yampa River above the Maybell Gaging Station for the benefit of any water-use project in the State of Utah, then the gross amount of all such diversions for use in the State of Utah, less any returns from such diversions to the river above Maybell, shall be added to the actual flow at the Maybell Gaging Station to determine the total flow at the Maybell Gaging Station.

(b) All consumptive use of the waters of the Yampa River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XIV

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and New Mexico as follows:

The State of Colorado agrees to deliver to the State of New Mexico from the San Juan River and its tributaries which rise in the State of Colorado a quantity of water which shall be sufficient, together with water originating in the San Juan Basin in the State of New Mexico, to enable the State of New Mexico to make full use of the water apportioned to the State of New Mexico by article III of this compact, subject, however, to the following:

(a) A first and prior right shall be recognized as to:

(1) All uses of water made in either State at the time of the signing of this compact; and

(2) All uses of water contemplated by projects authorized, at the time of the signing of this compact, under the laws of the United States of America, whether or not such projects are eventually constructed by the United States of America or by some other entity.

(b) The State of Colorado assents to diversions and storage of water in the State of Colorado for use in the State of New Mexico, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

(c) The uses of the waters of the San Juan River and any of its tributaries within either State which are dependent upon a common source of water and which are not covered by (a) hereof, shall in times of water shortages be reduced in such quantity that the resulting consumptive use in each State will bear the same proportionate relation to the consumptive use made in each State during times of average water supply as determined

by the Commission; provided, that any preferential uses of water to which Indians are entitled under article XIX shall be excluded in determining the amount of curtailment to be made under this paragraph.

(d) The curtailment of water use by either State in order to make deliveries at Lee Ferry as required by article IV of this compact shall be independent of any and all conditions imposed by this article and shall be made by each State, as and when required, without regard to any provision of this article.

(e) All consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made; provided, that consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XV

(a) Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact and of this compact, water of the upper Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes, and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

(b) The provisions of this compact shall not apply to or interfere with the right or power of any signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use, and control of water, the consumptive use of which is apportioned and available to such State by this compact.

ARTICLE XVI

The failure of any State to use the water, or any part thereof, the use of which is apportioned to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use to the Lower Basin or to any other State, nor shall it constitute a forfeiture or abandonment of the right to such use.

ARTICLE XVII

The use of any water now or hereafter imported into the natural drainage basin of the upper Colorado River system shall not be charged to any State under the apportionment of consumptive use made by this compact.

ARTICLE XVIII

(a) The State of Arizona reserves its rights and interests under the Colorado River compact as a State of the lower division and as a State of the lower basin.

(b) The State of New Mexico and the State of Utah reserve their respective rights and interests under the Colorado River compact as States of the lower basin.

ARTICLE XIX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as:

(a) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

(b) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America under the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 944).

(c) Affecting any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, in or to the waters of the upper Colorado River system, or its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

(d) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, or creating any obligation in the part of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, mu-

nicipality, or entity whatsoever, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

(e) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent which such laws would apply without regard to this compact.

ARTICLE XX

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination, all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XXI

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and approved by the Congress of the United States of America. Notice of ratification by the legislatures of the signatory States shall be given by the governor of each signatory State to the governor of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and the President is hereby requested to give notice to the governor of each of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States of America.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have executed six counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America, and one of which shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, this 11th day of October 1948.

CHARLES A. CARSON,

Commissioner for the State of Arizona.

CLIFFORD H. STONE,

Commissioner for the State of Colorado.

FRED E. WILSON,

Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.

EDWARD H. WATSON,

Commissioner for the State of Utah.

L. C. BISHOP,

Commissioner for the State of Wyoming.

GROVER A. GILES,

Secretary.

Approved:

HARRY W. BASHORE,

Representative of the United States of America.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, article I of the compact provides as follows:

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies, and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

Article II states certain definitions with respect to the phrases used in the compact.

Article III constitutes an attempt to substitute for the Supreme Court's ruling an agreement to apportion water.

Article III (a) reads as follows:

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per an-

num, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

I observe that the upper basin means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry. That is set forth in article II in describing the upper basin.

The lower basin, which by subdivision (a) of article III of this compact is to be treated equally with the upper basin, consists of the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada. I now read subsections (b) and (c) of article III:

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

I observe that subsequent to the adoption of this compact the Senate ratified a proposed treaty with the Republic of Mexico under which the people of the United States guaranteed to deliver to the people of Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually as the Colorado River enters the territory of our neighbor, Mexico.

Subsections (d) and (e) of article III provide as follows:

(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

I omit comment on the remaining subsections of this article.

Thus it was agreed by those who drafted this compact that 7,500,000 acre-feet each year would be apportioned to the lower basin, and a like amount to the upper basin, irrespective of any rights of appropriation which might be acquired subsequent to the adoption of the compact.

In a subsequent section of the proposed compact it was agreed that any rights then in existence to water in the river would remain unimpaired.

There is a serious dispute—and an honest one—as to what article III means. Article III purports to divide the waters equitably, and it speaks of beneficial consumptive use. What is beneficial consumptive use? This question is both relevant and important in any discussion

with respect to legislation such as Senate bill 500 contemplates.

One of the great experts on water law, who came from the State of Colorado, and who is called the father of the Colorado River compact, commented on the phrase "beneficial consumptive use." I refer to the late Delph E. Carpenter, who stated, in a report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Congress, pages 577 to 586, December 4, 1928:

The term "beneficial consumptive use" is to be distinguished from the amounts diverted from the river. It does not mean headgate diversion. It means the amount of water consumed and lost to the river during uses of the water diverted. Generally speaking, it is the difference between the aggregate diverted and the aggregate return flow. It is the net loss occurring through beneficial uses.

In Mr. Carpenter's opinion, the difference between the aggregate diverted and the aggregate return flow constituted beneficial consumptive use under the compact, in other words, diversions less returns to the river.

At any rate, the compact was approved by every State with the exception of one, namely, Arizona. Then it was provided by Congress that if the 6 States would approve the compact—in other words, all except Arizona—the compact would be approved by the Congress, provided that—a second condition—California, by her own legislative decision, limited herself in the use of water.

Before the compact could go into effect, and before any such development could take place in California with Federal assistance, not only would the compact have to be approved by all the States except Arizona, but, in addition, California was required to place a ceiling on the amount of water which she could use. That was the decision of the Congress. The State which I, in part, represent acquiesced and passed the required limitation statute, which the Congress at that time directed her to do.

When the bill which resulted in the Boulder Canyon Project Act was under consideration on the floor of the Senate, in December 1928, an amendment was adopted which now appears as a part of section 4 (a) of that act. It provided, in effect, that the project act should not take effect unless 7 States should ratify the compact within 6 months after the date of its adoption; and the President should so proclaim; or unless 6 of the States, including California, should ratify the compact and waive 7-State ratification, and the President should so proclaim; and California should agree, by act of its legislature, to limit the consumptive use—diversions less returns to the river—of water from the Colorado River system in California. So, as directed, California by law limited herself to 4,400,000 acre-feet of water apportioned to the lower basin by article III (a) of the Colorado River Compact, plus one-half of the excess or surplus water unapportioned by the compact.

That is what Congress told the State which I, in part, represent it must do, and that is what the State did.

Meanwhile, however, a different theory of what constituted beneficial consumptive use was developed among those

concerned with the problem in the upper basin. I do not have it in my heart to quarrel with reasonable people who disagree as to the meaning and intent of technical legal language.

I am sure it was upon a reasonable basis that those in the upper Colorado River Basin who are interested in the subject found that "beneficial consumptive use" was different in its intent and meaning from the sense which the State of California found. I vigorously deny the correctness of the upper basin definition.

Subsequently, Mr. President, in 1949, the States of the upper basin entered into their own compact. It contains a provision that "beneficial consumptive use," the phrase to which I have alluded, shall be determined "by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry"—appendix, volume II, page 60, article VII.

This constitutes an attempt to convert the compact from an Upper Colorado River system compact into a compact relating only to the main stream.

By definition, the Colorado River system includes the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States. I refer to article II of the Colorado River compact.

"Beneficial consumptive use," as California understood and understands the term, and as it was generally understood at the time of the compact negotiations, would include water lost to the system by evapo-transpiration, wherever such loss occurred.

Under the upper basin theory, only the effect at Lee Ferry of upstream uses is to be relevant and important.

Let me give an example, so that those interested in reading the RECORD may see what I am contending, under the theory of the upper Colorado River Basin States, the so-called inflow-outflow method. Assume a State diverted a million acre-feet of water and transported it to an area for use elsewhere. Had this water continued down the river, and en route through evaporation or transpiration, a loss of 200,000 acre-feet could have been expected by the time it reached the lower basin, the upper basin States would say, "We are chargeable under the Colorado River compact only with 800,000 acre-feet. We are not chargeable with the 200,000 acre-feet which would have been lost between the point of diversion and Lee Ferry." The lower basin States would disagree with that argument and say that evapo-transpiration is a part of the charge of the State which uses the water.

There we would have a question of interpretation, which has a direct bearing upon the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

I wish to allude to one or two more examples of that type of disagreement and then indicate what, in complete good faith, ought to be done with respect to the resolution of those situations.

Senators will recall that in article 3 (a) provision was made for the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum to the upper basin and to the lower basin, guaranteed in perpetuity.

The question arises: Does the apportionment under the compact of the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum mean an average of that amount over a period of years, or a maximum in any one year?

As in the interpretation of the phrase "beneficial consumptive use," the compact must be given the same interpretation in both basins, the upper basin and the lower basin.

The State of California contends that "per annum" means what it seems to mean, namely, each year, and that under the compact that amount of water shall be sent down annually. It is the contention of those in the upper Colorado Basin—and I believe I can say that it is also the contention of the Department of the Interior presently—that it means an average, and that to satisfy the requirement of the compact the upper basin can send 6 million acre-feet down 1 year if it lets 9 million acre-feet down the next year.

We deny it, and we deny it vigorously.

Ever since the compact was approved, ever since the Hoover Dam was created and built, and ever since the Federal Government found a reasonable area in which to assist the people in my State to operate and to provide water, California, through various public agencies, has entered into contracts with the Government of the United States, under which water has been taken from the Colorado River into the city of Los Angeles and into most of the cities in southern California, to supply them with that which they need to live. That was done under contracts which are firm and exist at the present time, and which call for amounts in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet, to which California limited itself, but of which, by the same token, the statute passed by Congress permitted California to avail herself.

That brings up the question of how much water should come down into the lower basin States each year, and that, too, may well be a question upon which reasonable minds may differ. However, there ought to be some manner of arriving at who gets what before we enact legislation which involves more than \$1,500,000,000.

I want the RECORD to indicate the views of a distinguished American. Those views coincide with my own, in great part, at least. This distinguished American graced the Senate as a highly respected Member. He is now the distinguished and able Governor of Colorado. I refer to the Honorable Edwin Johnson.

I do not remember ever meeting a man who was more generous to me with his time, when I was even less experienced than I am now, than our former colleague, Ed Johnson. I took a great interest in the comments he made on the compact which I am discussing.

On December 20 of last year Governor Johnson made a statement suggesting that "storage below the State of Colorado is not the answer." I shall not read his entire statement, although I think I shall, in a few moments, ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD in

its entirety. I quote from his statement, as follows:

Either the seven-State compact—

And that, Mr. President, is the same as the Colorado River compact—

specifically denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water which it cannot use for agricultural and domestic purposes or it does not deny us such a right. Either it denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power or it does not deny us that right. Let us look at the document which has been ratified by the legislatures of seven States for the correct answers to these pertinent questions.

Here is that irrevocable record:

"ARTICLE II

"(h) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"ARTICLE III

"(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses."

Mr. President, I again quote from Governor Johnson's statement:

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned from the Colorado River system the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given the permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an extra million acre-feet per annum of surplus water. However, the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

Who said that, Mr. President? That was not an individual residing in my State; that was the gentleman who is the present Governor of Colorado.

Here we have a compact which has been in existence since 1922 and which is susceptible, apparently, of various interpretations. I desire to be as fair and as frank as I can be in this discussion, but there is the comment which the Governor of Colorado made on the relative rights of the lower basin States and the upper basin States.

I read one more paragraph from Governor Johnson's statement:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin. Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

I cite that again, Mr. President, to emphasize that a prominent American, now the Governor of Colorado, agrees that a solemn compact to which all States in the Colorado River Basin except Arizona asserted must now be lived up to and adhered to under any legislation which this Congress may enact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Gov. Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORAGE BELOW THE STATE OF COLORADO IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Statement released to press December 20, 1954, by Governor-elect Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado)

Interested persons on the eastern and western slopes of Colorado have expressed confidence in me, as Governor, to resolve the very controversial water problem that plagues both slopes. This is a tremendous responsibility and challenge but its vital nature demands my acceptance. Accordingly, I shall do my utmost to work out something which will benefit both slopes and injure neither.

However, before we begin the task of allocating Colorado's share of the water of the Colorado River system, we first must take stock of the quantity and the location of the water that is available to us. There are very serious misconceptions, widely held, in regard to the burdens placed on this State by the specific provisions of the Seven State Compact and the official interpretations with respect to them. These limitations should be understood clearly by all parties concerned, since they are basic to any plan to develop the upper Colorado River Basin. It is with that purpose in mind that I have prepared this document. If my conclusions are in error I want to be shown wherein the error lies.

Either the 7-State compact specifically denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water which it cannot use for agricultural and domestic purposes or it does not deny us such a right. Either it denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power or it does not deny us that right. Let us look at the document which has been ratified by the legislature of seven States for the correct answers to these pertinent questions.

Here is that irrevocable record:

"ARTICLE II

"(h) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"ARTICLE III

"(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses."

The Honorable Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, was appointed by the President to serve as chairman of the Seven State Compact Commission as the official representative of the Government of the United States, pursuant to an act of Congress. He was the chairman of the Colorado River Commission that drafted and signed the Seven State Colorado River compact. In answer to the question propounded by Congressman HAYDEN these points in the compact were interpreted officially by him on January 27, 1923, before any State had ratified the compact, as follows:

"Question 14. Can paragraph (d) of article III be construed to mean that the States of the upper division may withhold all except 75 million acre-feet of water within any period of 10 years and thus not only secure the amount to which they are entitled under the apportionment made in paragraph (a) but also the entire unapportioned surplus waters of the Colorado River?

"Answer. No. Paragraph (a) of article III apportions to the upper basin 7,500,000 acre-

feet per annum. Paragraph (e) of article III provides that the States of the upper division shall not withhold water that cannot be beneficially used. Paragraph (f) and (g) of this article specifically leave to further apportionment water now unapportioned. There is, therefore, no possibility of construing paragraph (d) of this article as suggested.

"Question 19. Why is the impounding of water for power purposes made subservient to its use and consumption for agricultural and domestic purposes, as provided in paragraph (b) of article IV?

"Answer. (a) Because such subordination conforms to established law, either by constitution or statute, in most of the semiarid States. This provision frees the farmer from the danger of damage suits by power companies in the event of conflict between them. (b) Because the cultivation of land naturally outranks in importance the generation of power, since it is the most important of human activities, the foundation upon which all other industries finally rest. (c) Because there was a general agreement by all parties appearing before the commission, including those representing power interests, that such preference was proper.

"Question 20. Will this subordination of the development of hydroelectric power to domestic and agricultural uses, combined with the apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water to the upper basin, utterly destroy an asset of the State of Arizona consisting of 3 million horsepower, which it is said could otherwise be developed within that State if the Colorado River continued to flow, undiminished in volume, across its northern boundary line and through the Grand Canyon?

"Answer. The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above, that cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes."

On December 15, 1922, Hon. Delph E. Carpenter, commissioner for Colorado, reported to Gov. Oliver H. Shoup his analysis of this compact which he helped to formulate. His comments and observations are especially pertinent. In this official report he said:

"Power claims will always be limited by the quantity of water necessary for domestic and agricultural purposes. The generation of power is made subservient to the preferred and dominant uses and shall not interfere with junior preferred uses in either basin."

On March 20, 1923, Delph E. Carpenter in a joint letter to Colorado Senator M. E. Bashor and Colorado Representative Royal W. Calkins, said, among other things:

"All power uses in both basins are made subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

The interpretation of Hon. W. S. Norviel, commissioner for Arizona, published January 15, 1923, contains this language:

"The third principle established by the compact was to fix a time when the remainder of the water unallotted and unused might be apportioned.

"The fourth principle fixes a preference in agricultural uses over power.

"The fifth principle, that the upper States shall not withhold water that cannot be reasonably applied for agricultural uses."

Senator Hayden, Arizona, propounded 19 questions to Hon. A. P. Davis, Director, United States Reclamation Service, to which the director made the following replies on January 30, 1923:

"Question 10. Is it true that, if the Colorado River compact is adopted, all of the water that Arizona will ever get out of the main river will be enough to irrigate only 280,000 acres of land, of which 130,000 acres

are now embraced in the Yuma project and 110,000 acres in the Parker project?

"Answer. The Colorado River compact does not attempt to divide the water of the river between individual States. Except for rights already initiated by California and Nevada, there is nothing in the compact that will prevent the State of Arizona from taking from the river all the water that it can put to beneficial use.

"Question 19. Any further comment that you may care to make relative to the approval of the Colorado River compact by the Arizona State Legislature will be appreciated.

"Answer. The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all of the yield of the lower basin, and that any water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below."

It should be noted that these official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified by any State except Nevada and were not disputed by Colorado or any other State at the time it ratified the compact. Most certainly we are bound hand and foot by them.

At the time the seven-State compact was adopted and ratified, it was contemplated that a treaty would be negotiated later between the United States and Mexico which would allocate to Mexico certain quantities of water defined in acre-feet, out of the Colorado River system. Furthermore, it spelled out just how that burden should fall upon the lower basin and the upper basin. The compact specified that to the extent there is surplus water in the Colorado River system, such surplus water would be utilized and the balance of the burden would be shared equally by the upper and lower basins.

"ARTICLE III

"(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then, the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

"(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

If the upper basin States build storage reservoirs at the Glen Canyon and Echo Park sites as is now contemplated, the water withheld thereby will, of necessity, be surplus water since the upper States cannot use it for agricultural or domestic purposes, and the upper States, therefore, must deliver such water to Mexico as is allocated to her under the provision of the seven-State compact.

Senator HAYDEN asked Chairman of the Commission, Herbert Hoover, about this and was answered as follows:

"Question 15. Does paragraph (d) of article III in any way modify the obligation of the States of the upper division, as expressed in paragraph (c), to permit the surplus and unapportioned water to flow down in satisfaction of any right to water which may hereafter be accorded by treaty to Mexico?

Within any year of a 10-year period, could the States of the upper division shift to the States of the lower division the entire burden of supplying such water to Mexico?

"Answer. (a) No. It is provided in the compact that the upper States shall add their share of any Mexican burden to the delivery to be made at Lee Ferry, whenever any Mexican rights shall be established by treaty. By paragraph (c) of article III, such an amount of water is to be delivered in addition to the 75 million acre-feet otherwise provided for. (b) In the face of the specific provision of article III (c) that the burden of any deficiency must be 'equally borne,' I can see no possibility of placing upon the lower division the entire burden. If the surplus is sufficient, there is no burden on anyone. If it is insufficient the plain language is that it must be equally shared, with the equally plain provision that the upper division must furnish its half."

Delph Carpenter in his official report to Governor Shoup said:

"Any waters necessary to supply lands in the Republic of Mexico (hereafter to be determined by international treaty) shall be supplied from the surplus flow of the river. If the surplus is not sufficient, any deficiency shall be borne equally by the upper basin and the lower basin."

I am certain that Mr. Carpenter would have added, had he thought such a doubt were to be raised, "Water held in the upper basin to generate power and which for physical reasons could not be used by the upper basin for agricultural or domestic purposes is surplus water to the upper basin." Such an interpretation must be crystal clear to any student of the seven-State compact and the official interpretations of its provisions.

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned from the Colorado River system the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given the permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an extra million acre-feet per annum of surplus water. However, the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

"ARTICLE III

"(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and to the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

"(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a) the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum."

But here is the catch in this award:

"(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

The following quotes from the questions by Senator HAYDEN and answered on January 27, 1923, by Chairman of the Commission Herbert Hoover leave nothing to the imagination with respect to the extra 1 million acre-feet of surplus water awarded the lower basin. The extra million acre-feet is to be

met out of surplus waters over and above the 7,500,000 acre-feet allocated annually to each of the two basins and it does not take priority over the upper States award of 7,500,000 feet provided they use all of their 7,500,000 for agricultural and domestic purposes. If the upper basin stores water for power purposes at least a million acre-feet per annum must go to satisfy this demand.

"Question 6. Are the 1 million additional acre-feet of water apportioned to the lower basin in paragraph (b) of article III supposed to be obtained from the Colorado River or solely from the tributaries of that stream within the State of Arizona?

"Answer. The use of the words 'such waters' in this paragraph clearly refers to waters from the Colorado River system, and the extra 1 million acre-feet provided for can therefore be taken from the main river or from any of its tributaries.

"Question 22. Does the Colorado River compact apportion any water to the State of Arizona?

"Answer. No; nor to any other State individually. The apportionment is to the groups."

It should be noted, and I repeat, that Secretary Hoover's official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified by any State; furthermore it was not disputed by any of them when they did ratify it.

On December 15, 1922, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter in his official report to the Governor of Colorado, the Honorable Oliver H. Shoup, submitted several tables explaining the allocation of the water of the Colorado River system.

Table 4 reads as follows:

	Acre-feet
Upper division allocation, includes present consumption...	7,500,000
Lower division allocation, includes present consumption...	7,500,000
Lower division permissible increase in water consumption...	1,000,000
Total allocated or permitted.....	16,000,000
Unallocated surplus (estimated).....	4,500,000
Estimated average annual water supply.....	20,500,000

Mr. Carpenter also said in this report:

"At any time after 40 years, if the development in the upper basin has reached 7,500,000 acre-feet annual beneficial consumptive use or that of the lower basin has reached 8,500,000 acre-feet, any two States may call for a further apportionment of any surplus waters of the river."

On March 20, 1923, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter, in a joint letter to Colorado Senator M. E. Bashor and Colorado Representative Royal W. Calkins, said, among other things:

"Paragraph (b), article III, permits the lower basin to increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet. The two paragraphs permit an aggregate annual beneficial consumptive use of 8,500,000 acre-feet, and no more. The words 'per annum,' as used in paragraph (b) are not synonymous with the word 'annually.' No cumulative increase is intended by that paragraph."

On February 10, 1923, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter addressed a telegram to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman, Colorado River Commission, and received a prompt reply. On February 13, 1923, he addressed a telegram to the Honorable R. T. McKisick, deputy attorney general, Sacramento, Calif., and that same day received a reply.

These exchanges of telegrams are pertinent to an understanding of this phase of the compact and are inserted here:

CAPITOL BUILDING,

Denver, Colo., February 10, 1923.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,

Chairman, Colorado River

Commission, Washington, D. C.

Do you concur with me that the intent of the Commission in framing the Colorado River compact is as follows:

That paragraph (b) of article III means that the lower basin may increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet and no more?

DELPH E. CARPENTER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 12, 1923.

DELPH E. CARPENTER,

State Capitol, Denver, Colo.:

I concur with you, and shall so advise Congress in my report, that the intent of the Commission in framing the Colorado River compact was as follows:

Paragraph (b) of article III means that lower basin may acquire rights under the compact to annual beneficial consumptive use of water in excess of the apportionment in paragraph (a) of that article by 1 million acre-feet and no more. There is nothing in the compact to prevent the States of either basin using more water than the amount apportioned under paragraphs (a) and (b) of article III, but such use would be subject to the further apportionment provided for in paragraph (f) of article III and would vest no rights under the present compact.

HERBERT HOOVER.

DENVER, COLO., February 13, 1923.

R. T. McKISICK,

Deputy Attorney General,

Sacramento, Calif.:

Do you concur with me that intent of Commission in framing Colorado River compact was as follows:

That paragraph (b) of article III means that the lower basin may increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet and no more?

DELPH E. CARPENTER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., February 13, 1923.

Hon. DELPH E. CARPENTER,

State Capitol, Denver, Colo.:

Am of opinion that paragraph (b) of article III permits increase of annual beneficial consumptive use of water by lower basin to 8,500,000 acre-feet total or 1 million in excess quantity apportioned each basin in perpetuity by paragraph (a), article III, and no more. When both paragraphs are read together no other construction tenable. "Per annum" not synonymous with "annually."

R. T. McKISICK.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., February 15, 1923.

DELPH E. CARPENTER,

Denver, Colo.:

My interpretation of article III and VIII well expressed in McKisick's wire of the 13th.

W. F. McCLURE,

Seven State Compact Commissioner
for California.

Utah Commissioner R. E. Caldwell, in his report to the Utah Senate, among other things said:

"The lower basin States, for the most part, when they divert their water, wholly consume it and they get no credit for use of return flow for it does not exist, and they are, therefore, limited to the diversion of 8,500,000 acre-feet and are held strictly to the requirement of consumptive beneficial use of such as they do divert."

In the report to the Governor of California by Hon. W. F. McClure, commissioner for California, made January 8, 1923, appears this statement:

"In conclusion permit me to add that the terms of the compact do full justice to the States in interest, and the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system whereby the lower basin is allocated 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, with an allowable increase of 1 million acre-feet per annum by reason of the probably rapid development upon the lower river, and fully guarantees to California an ample water supply to adequately care for the enormous future growth of the Imperial Valley and adjacent territory."

The Honorable Herbert Hoover, who, as I have said, was the chairman of the commission that drafted and approved by its unanimous vote the seven-State compact, said:

"The lower basin will, therefore, receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes."

The Honorable A. P. Davis, Director of the Reclamation Bureau, on January 30, 1923, announced that:

"The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all of the yield of the lower basin, and that any water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses (in the upper basin) shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below."

This data proves conclusively that the extra 1 million acre-feet of water per annum allocated to the lower basin is to be acquired from the surplus and otherwise unallocated water of the Colorado River system. The same is true of the 1,500,000 allocated annually by treaty to the United States of Mexico.

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin. Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the seven-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the seven-State compact was ratified. In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

The Reclamation Bureau estimates that the proposed storage reservoirs in the upper Colorado Basin will cost the upper basin 880,000 acre-feet annually in evaporation. It will be charged to the upper basin as consumptive use. Colorado's portion of that loss would be 400,000 acre-feet.

Water still does not run up hill, and storage down the river from Colorado to generate electric energy, frowned upon by the 7-State compact, cannot secure for use 1 drop of water, but to the contrary, will cost us 400,000 acre-feet annually in evaporation, which under the upper Colorado Basin compact will be charged to Colorado as consumptive use.

Colorado is close to the bottom of the barrel insofar as Colorado River water is concerned. Colorado has a record of lavish generosity to all of her neighbor States. Now at this late date it will be State suicide unless she looks after her own interests with courage and wisdom. She positively cannot afford the loss of 400,000 additional acre-feet. She cannot afford to agree to a storage plan

whose certain effect will be to create additional surplus water out of the upper basin's meager supply, which under the 7-State compact must go to the lower basin. Colorado must insist that the 42 reservoirs surveyed in the high country of Colorado be authorized simultaneously with the authorization of the storage plan and which will give Colorado an absolute right to the water which is developed.

The Hill report prepared pursuant to a contract with the Colorado Legislature indicates there is something over a million acre-feet of unappropriated water in the Colorado River system in Colorado. However, the Hill report did not charge Colorado with the burden of Colorado's portion of the priority commitment to Mexico, which under the 7-State compact cannot be less than 375,000 acre-feet. And, another thing, if Glen Canyon and the Echo Park reservoirs are built, Colorado's portion of the Mexican burden becomes not less than 750,000 acre-feet annually. Had Mr. Hill recognized these binding and irrevocable priorities and the evaporation of the down-river storage plans, which is to be charged to Colorado as "consumptive use" of 400,000 acre-feet, he could not have shown any unappropriated water whatsoever in Colorado for Colorado.

Colorado has entered into irrevocable compacts with all of the States to the east, west, north, and south. In each of these compacts Colorado has been generous to a fault. Now most of her water is lost forever, and yet her neighbors are asking her to surrender more and more of this most precious resource. The time has come when Colorado's dwindling supply must be guarded jealously and protected fully. That is a responsibility which I, as Governor of Colorado, must assume.

Who will say that the Glen Canyon Dam in the State of Arizona and the Echo Park Dam on the Colorado-Utah border are not extraordinary dams from an engineering point of view. Glen Canyon is the sort of project that makes an engineer's mouth water, and the Reclamation Bureau is a Bureau of engineers. Who will say that these projects will not be of incalculable value to the lower basin. Glen Canyon, which will collect 100,000 acre-feet of silt a year, will extend the life of the Hoover project 500 years, but what I want someone to tell me is, "Why should they be built with upper Colorado Basin funds at the water expense of the State of Colorado?"

There is only one route remaining for us to take. We must put our water to beneficial use in our own State if we are to gain any right to it. That is the plain language of the 7-State compact. It states that condition with equivocation. The Reclamation Bureau has explored 42 reservoir sites high up on the Colorado River system in Colorado. We cannot, we dare not settle for less than their authorization now. Congressional authorization does not mean immediate construction, but it will give to these proposed reservoir sites an official priority. Colorado contributes 72 percent of the water of the upper Colorado River Basin. Is it asking too much that we be allowed to use less than one-fourth of what we produce? If that is wrong, then I am wrong.

ED C. JOHNSON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish now to speak very briefly concerning Indian rights to Colorado River waters.

The 1922 compact provides in article VII thereof that nothing therein shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States to Indian tribes. article VII of the upper basin compact of 1948 requires that uses of water by the United States and its wards shall be

charged as a use by the State in which the use is made.

Let me quote one of the witnesses testifying in favor of similar legislation before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last year. I refer to Judge Jean Breitenstein. He said, page 290 of the 1954 report on Senate bill 1555:

A California spokesman in the House hearings on this project has stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has construed the compact as meaning that the Indian claims in effect are prior and constitute the first demand upon the water supply. If such a theory should be upheld, then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize the importance of that statement, on the part of a witness appearing in favor of legislation similar to that with which we are today confronted:

If such a theory should be upheld, then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

Mr. President, across the street in the United States Supreme Court there is pending a lawsuit brought by the State of Arizona against the State of California and other parties. The Government of the United States has intervened in that lawsuit. At issue are interpretations of the Colorado River compact to which I have alluded. In part the controversy revolves around the rights of Indians to waters involved in the Colorado River compact. That is a serious question in this controversy. As I have said, the Colorado River compact provides that nothing in that document shall impair the obligations of the United States to the Indian tribes.

In the report of Mr. Delph E. Carpenter, to whom I have previously referred, it is stated that the apportionment to each basin includes all diversions necessary to serve Indians and Indian tribes.

The upper Colorado Basin has a similar provision in its compact. However, in its petition of intervention in the pending case of Arizona against California, the United States alleges that the rights to the use of water by Indians and Indian tribes are in no way subject to or affected by the Colorado River compact.

During the hearings this year, the committee heard testimony by the head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, of the Department of the Interior. I attempted to elicit from him exactly what the position of the Government of the United States was with respect to Indian rights in the waters of the Colorado River. I asked him the following question, which appears on page 41 of the printed hearings:

Mr. Emmons, what is the present view of your office respecting the rights of Indians to water on the Colorado River?

Mr. Emmons replied:

Senator, first and foremost, I am interested in the rights established by treaties for the Indians—all Indians of the country. I believe that the Indians' requirements should be considered primarily.

On this matter, however, the Indians, the same as they have in most other places,

have been practical and have indicated just what their absolute requirements might be.

I then asked Mr. Emmons this question:

Does your office have a firm position with respect to any priorities on the rights of Indians to Colorado River water?

Mr. Emmons answered:

I do not believe I am prepared to answer that, Senator.

Indeed, I think I may say, Mr. President, with complete sincerity, that the Department of the Interior has taken one position on the question of Indian rights to the waters of the Colorado River, and that the Department of Justice has taken, or at least has been inclined to take, a diametrically opposite position upon the same fundamental question. If the rights of Indian tribes are finally determined to be a first claim on the waters, then the whole basin will be thrown into chaos.

I respectfully suggest to my colleagues who may desire to read the record that there is only one place in which a fair, honest, and impartial determination of who is right and who is wrong on these legal problems can be made, and that is in the Supreme Court of the United States. As a matter of fact, the State of California, as a defendant in the action, the other day asked the Supreme Court to consider joining in the lawsuit all the other States which are parties to the Colorado River compact. The Supreme Court appointed a master and referred that question to him.

As the debate on the bill proceeds in the Senate today, and as I suppose it will continue tomorrow, the problem of whether the other States in the Colorado River Basin should be joined in the lawsuit is presently under consideration by a master appointed by the Supreme Court.

While I rather regret that it sometimes is necessary to resort to litigation when the public interest is involved, and I believe that negotiation is the best way to handle these problems, nevertheless, so long as a lawsuit, which involves the question of the interpretation of the Colorado River compact, is being tried in the Supreme Court then I think, and I hope, that the other States may be joined, so that a final judicial decision may answer those questions for all time. But that is not a matter on which I should pass judgment, and I assume I should make no comment concerning it.

I wish to make one more statement with respect to the responsibilities of the States in the Basin. The two predecessors in the Senate of my able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and I many years ago objected on the floor to the ratification of the treaty with the Republic of Mexico. They were joined by a handful of Senators—no more. Finally, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, ratified the treaty. I make no comment today on that action, except to say that some present Members of the Senate, with whom I have discussed the problem, take a little different view from that held by their predecessors in days gone by, when an additional burden was

placed upon the States in the Colorado River Basin to carry water to our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico.

The bill before the Senate provides for the construction of 6 storage dams, capable of storing 40,390,000 acre-feet of water, costing \$821,886,000; plus 33 participating projects. It calls for an investment of \$874,281,800 to supply 1,208,645 acres with new supplemental water. Six storage dams and 33 participating projects, Mr. President.

It is true that the present administration recommended legislation designed to assist in the development of the States of the upper Colorado River Basin. It is also true that the development plan as outlined by the administration consisted of 2 major storage dams, not 6; and 11 participating irrigation and reclamation projects, not 33.

I am certain that my friends, particularly the able junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], will permit me to make the statement, and will agree with it, that the great majority of the projects authorized, or tentatively authorized, in the bill have not been approved by the Department of the Interior, nor have any reports on feasibility been issued.

I must say that, to me, a comparative newcomer in the Senate, it is a little difficult to follow a theory of legislation which would authorize any project in advance, and then would say that when an administrator in the Department of the Interior has subsequently approved it, Congress will approve it. That is putting the legislative cart before the legislative horse, in my judgment.

It is true—and I wish to speak with specific accuracy—that the measure contains a group of projects which it is provided must come back to Congress for a second time. But, again, what useful purpose would be served by such qualified congressional authorization, only to be followed by a second?

I believe a portion of the answer can be found in the discussion in the committee with respect to the intention of the bill. I think the proposed legislation, in its present form, attempts to indicate, if the bill be passed, that the projects included are only a part of an overall development which would follow automatically if the bill became law.

I read from page 7 of the bill, beginning on line 7, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

This constitutes, I think I may say in complete accuracy, something of a brand new or novel approach to authorizing legislation. Here some projects are authorized; others are authorized, subject to an administrative finding; and a third

category is authorized, subject (a) to an administrative finding, and (b) to a second congressional authorization. And here also all these indicated other unnamed projects will in the future be authorized.

In committee I asked what useful purpose could be served by that device and a so-called declaration of intent. I need not say that one Congress cannot bind another, and that a declaration of intent indulged in by the 84th Congress will be of no force and effect on the 85th or any subsequent Congress.

I shall again in all frankness say, Mr. President, that the committee did revise section 2; and I should like to repeat what I said earlier in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that I have been treated in his committee with all the courtesy and friendship that any man could expect. I only regret that I was not more effective in the efforts which I made.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. While I recognize there is a problem in trying to commit future Congresses—a problem which the Senator has mentioned—this procedure grows out of the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has said, in respect to utilizing water in these Western States, "There are certain of those projects we would like to sponsor, but unfortunately the States own the water within their borders. Will you give us some directions as to how you would like to see it done, and we will study those projects?"

This is not an attempt to bind the Congress. This is an attempt on the part of certain States, Colorado particularly, to say, "These are the projects we would like to see studied."

That is the reason why I agree it is loose language, because some projects will have to come to Congress again for confirmation. However, we tried to indicate that we were not endeavoring to commit Congress to anything in the future; we say only that Congress shall have a look at it. I think to that degree and to that extent the Senator from California has made a good contribution to the work of our committee, even though he may think he returned empty-handed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. On the same point I wish to refer to the hearings. When Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl was testifying, and when he was asked if the Department endorsed all provisions of S. 500, his answer was:

I do not think that I would care to make a full and straight answer to the question that you have asked.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to refer very briefly to the official letter from the Bureau of the Budget. I wish to read from that letter on S. 500, which is dated March 17, 1955, and reads in part:

In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of

the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navajo participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the Bureau of the Budget be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1955.
Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My DEAR Mr. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge Mr. Stewart French's letter of January 20, 1955, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 500, a bill "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Enactment of legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project was recommended by the President both in his state of the Union message and his budget message this year. The views of this Bureau concerning the details of such legislation were expressed in letters of March 18, 1954, to your committee and to the Secretary of the Interior, which are printed in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, 2d session. On April 1, 1954, a draft bill, which was developed in collaboration with the Department of the Interior, was submitted to your committee.

With respect to the detailed provisions of S. 500, this Bureau has the following comments:

1. In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navaho participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

2. There would appear to be ample justification for the closest cooperation between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior concerning the agricultural aspects of the participating projects. The use of the word "consultation" on page 3, line 25, would,

therefore, be understood to mean consultation in its broadest sense.

3. Section 7 and reference to it in section 1 (2) (a) (iii) is interpreted to mean that all costs for improvements in fish and wildlife, as well as mitigation of losses not attributable to the construction of the project, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable and shall be financed by the agencies responsible for these programs. However, the cost of preventing damage attributable to the construction of the project should be treated as a part of the cost and allocated to the various purposes in the same manner as other damages. The addition of clarifying language would avoid misinterpretations.

4. The inclusion of section 10 in our draft bill referred to above, namely, "Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country," would appear to be a desirable addition to S. 500, since this would be the principal consideration in determining rate of construction and development.

5. It is considered that the authorization should be limited to \$950 million, as proposed in the draft bill, in order to give the Congress a greater measure of control over the extent of the development and an opportunity to review the program from time to time.

6. Since we do not have detailed information concerning the city of Denver's proposed Blue River project or the effects of the provisions of section 11 of S. 500 on the interests of the Federal Government or on pending litigation, we are not in a position to comment on this section at this time, and have requested the Department of Justice to review this section.

7. The Bureau of the Budget also is not in a position to comment on section 12, until we have received the views of the Department of Justice on this section.

8. It is recommended that the title be amended to read, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Accordingly, it is recommended that S. 500 be amended as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

(At this point Mr. KUCHEL yielded to Mrs. SMITH of Maine, who addressed the Senate and reported on her recent world tour. Her speech appears in the RECORD, following Mr. KUCHEL's remarks.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly now on the question of quality of water as it is raised in the pending legislation. Article VIII of the Colorado River compact provides:

Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unhampered by this compact.

In the lawsuit Arizona against California, California alleges that the word "unhampered" as used in that article of the compact means unhampered as to both quantity and quality of water to which the perfected rights relate. California alleges that as of the effective date of the compact, her present perfected rights are to be not less than 4,950,000 acre-feet of water.

When the hearings were held on S. 500, one of the distinguished citizens of my State who testified was Mr. Evan T. Hewes, a member of the Colorado River Board of California and past chairman of it, and a long-time resident of the Imperial Valley in southern California,

where he has made his living as a farmer.

Mr. Hewes said, in part, when he was testifying:

The major participating projects included in S. 500 would be transmountain diversion projects. These would divert water from high elevations out of the Colorado River Basin. This is water of the highest quality, and, therefore, the result would be a serious impairment of the quality of the water coming into the lower basin at Lee Ferry.

At the present time water in the lower basin contains about 1 ton of salts per acre-foot. This means that if we apply, say, 4 acre-feet of water per acre of crop during the year, we put 4 tons of salt on that acre. Whether the salt content of the water may be increased, and if so, how much, without affecting the production of the types of crops we grow, has not been determined.

We say that until this matter of quality has been finally determined in all respects, there should be no additional transmountain diversion projects constructed in the upper basin.

S. 500 would authorize the construction of six large storage reservoirs, from which there would be evaporation of large quantities of water, also increasing the salt content of the lower basin water at Lee Ferry. These reservoirs are not needed to deliver water for domestic and agricultural purposes in the upper basin and, therefore, under article III-e of the compact, this water lost through reservoir evaporation is water to which the lower basin has a right for domestic and agricultural purposes.

Mr. Hewes in good faith raised a serious question. I say to you, Mr. President, that no adequate scientific research has been conducted by any agency of the Government of the United States, or otherwise, to determine the quality of water in the Colorado River, and at what point salinity would become a serious hazard or problem.

It seems to me that the representatives who appeared in opposition to the pending bill were on sound ground in suggesting that before enacting any such proposed legislation of the magnitude here envisioned, there should be a thorough scientific study by the Federal Government of what effect the projects contemplated by the bill would have on the quality of water as it reached the lower basin.

Mr. President, that does not seem too unreasonable a question for me to raise. It seems to me it is a logical position for the representatives of California to assume.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to allude very briefly to the fact that the two largest storage dams originally encompassed in Senate bill 500—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams—would be geographically located so that it would be practically impossible for any of the impounded waters in either of those reservoirs to be used beneficially in the upper basin of the Colorado River. Geographically, they approach the dividing line between the two basins. Indeed, I think the proponents of the bill would be frank to concede that those 2 dams—and now 4 more storage dams—are contemplated, not in the interest of the beneficial use of water, but primarily in the interest of the generation of hydroelectric power to foot the bill for the 33 participating projects.

Earlier I referred to the Colorado River compact, and particularly to article III (e), reading as follows:

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

Mr. President, I also wish to refer to article IV (b), reading as follows:

(b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

I suggest that in the absence of a complete agreement, which is not present here, there would be a constant question of administration of the upper Colorado River project and a continuing disagreement as to the responsibility of the Department of the Interior with respect to the waters impounded in the dams provided for in the pending bill. All parties will concede that not one drop of the water in the storage units would thereafter be utilized for agricultural or domestic purposes in the upper basin.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from California understand that in order to comply with the terms of the compact storage dams have to be built to hold water with which to supply the lower basin with the amounts of water it was given under the compact, and that also in order to permit the upper basin States to apply their water supplies to irrigation and domestic consumptive use, they must have these dams, so that, by exchange, they can send to the lower basin water from the dams, and can take out water from the streams higher up? Is the Senator from California acquainted with that principle of irrigation and reclamation law in the West?

Mr. KUCHEL. I reply to my friend and able colleague, the Senator from Utah, by saying that in raising this question, I confine myself—as I suggest he confine himself—to the provisions of the Colorado River compact. To that extent, he and I must agree that the water in the dam—the water in Glen Canyon Dam, for example—can never be used for beneficial and consumptive use in the upper basin of the Colorado River.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot concede that, if the Senator from California is asking me that question. The physical water at that point may not actually be used there; it is given in exchange for other waters which would have to go down to the users in the lower basin, if it were not for these dams. That principle is now well established in the West—namely, that water can be exchanged. If there is stored in a bank, so to speak, water which can be sent to the users in the lower basin, then water can be taken, in exchange, from the

stream from which the users in the lower basin might otherwise obtain their supply. In order to take water from the higher reaches in the upper-basin territory, it will be necessary to have water which can be sent to the users in the lower-basin territory, in order to fulfill the terms of the compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish that my friend, the Senator from Utah, would agree with me; but I am afraid that he will not. But I do not think there should be any disagreement here when I say that the water stored in Glen Canyon Dam, for example, cannot thereafter be used for beneficial purposes in the upper basin of the Colorado River. The sections of the Colorado River compact to which I refer raise a question, which would be a continuing irritant unless in advance it were clearly understood by all the parties exactly what Senate bill 500 purports to do.

Mr. WATKINS. How could there be any damage to the lower basin States if they obtain the amount of water the compact calls for, regardless of whether it is the exact water which would flow down the stream through these reservoirs or whether it is water taken from these rivers and held back for a time and then allowed to flow down, while at the same time the users in the upper basin are taking water directly from the streams?

I could show the Senator very directly how that operates, if I had time in which to do so. It is a technical matter, which would not involve any substantial damage or any damage whatever to the lower basin States. They would get all the water they require, and it would be water from the identical streams, except it would be water which would have been stored for a while.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall listen with great interest to the presentation my friend, the Senator from Utah, will make.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have indicated to the Senate some of the disputes over the meaning of the compact. Everyone agrees that the Colorado River compact must be complied with. Some persons may not like it; but it was entered into in good faith, and it is the law. I do not propose to have it breached to the detriment of California.

My only suggestion on that point is that until the Supreme Court of the United States decides the meaning of the various sections of the compact, my friend, the Senator from Utah, and I will not be able to arrive at what the lower basin is entitled to and what the upper basin is entitled to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to understand the Senator from California. Is he now contending that by reason of what he thinks the compact means, the lower basin States would be in a position to block us from using for power purposes any of the water which we may have stored in the upper reaches of the Colorado River?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I would not say that. I would say specifically—and then I ask the Senator to allow me to sum up

the few remaining points—that the answer to his question is article IV, section (b) of the compact, which I have just read, and which, in essence, says that while water may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, such impounding must be subservient to consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes, and shall not interfere with the use for such purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. I will say that the storage of water in all those dams, the main dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River, will be for that primary purpose, so that we can use the water consumptively in the upper basin States; and incidental thereto would be the development of electricity. It would be a case in which there could be no damage to the lower basin States. They would get the water. So far as concerns the ability to determine whether it is the exact water they think they should get, or some other, they would have extreme difficulty in making any kind of case in any court on the theory that they had been damaged. They would get the full amount of water. It would be regulated. It would come to them under even better conditions than the compact would call for, because with the building at Glen Canyon, there will be no silt. The silt would be deposited in Glen Canyon, and the Mead Reservoir would have its life extended 200 years as a gift from the upper basin States, and without any cost whatever to the lower basin States. They would have clear water, much better quality water than they would have without such a reservoir.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend for his views. I disagree with them. On the question of quality of water, I do not believe there is anyone connected with the Government of the United States who can point to a sufficient study and survey of the problem and give a correct answer to the question as to the quality of the water.

Mr. President, last December the Department of the Interior wrote a letter to a local Washington firm of attorneys. The letter was introduced in a hearing which a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held. It has a bearing on this problem. The letter is from Mr. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and is dated December 2, 1954. There was involved a dispute between two cities, one in California and one in Arizona, with respect to a continuing supply of water. That letter says in part:

As a result of reexamination early in August it was determined that the generation at Hoover power plant should be reduced to 88 percent of the contract amount of firm energy for the current operating year, equivalent to a reduction of 502 million kilowatt hours during a period of ten months. All of the Hoover allottees concurred in this curtailment. The decision of no net withdrawal of storage credit during the operating year was confirmed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, D. C., December 2, 1954.
COX, LANGFORD, STODDARD & CUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: You submitted a proposal in behalf of California-Pacific Utilities Co. in your letter of September 1, 1954, that the United States contract with the company for 20 million kilowatt-hours annually of the storage credit (sometimes referred to as "pink water") energy available to the Parker-Davis project. The energy would be used to supply the Needles, Calif., system of the company which is presently obtaining energy under the Boulder Canyon project contract No. 11r-1366.

The present circumstances as to Hoover powerplant generation are significant to this matter. The streamflow into Lake Mead during the period April through July 1954 was the second lowest April-July runoff of the 31-year record of flows at Grand Canyon. The integration meeting held June 14, 1954, resulted in the adoption of a generation schedule for Hoover powerplant of firm energy only for the year ending May 31, 1955, because of the low level of Lake Mead and the prospect for deficient inflow. The Parker-Davis project was not to make any net withdrawal of storage credit during the year. As a result of reexamination early in August it was determined that the generation at Hoover powerplant should be reduced to 88 percent of the contract amount of firm energy for the current operating year, equivalent to a reduction of 502 million kilowatt-hours during a period of 10 months. All of the Hoover allottees concurred in this curtailment. The decision of no net withdrawal of storage credit during the operating year was confirmed.

Approximately one-third of this Hoover reduction must be absorbed by the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, both preference customers of the Parker-Davis project. In the circumstances, the United States was obliged to decline the requests of these preference agencies for storage credit energy, and they have accordingly completed arrangements to purchase steam energy from non-Federal sources to augment their available supplies of Hoover and Parker-Davis energy. It will be seen, therefore, that the requirements of preference customers have not been met, because the United States is unable presently to meet those needs.

We regret the necessity of informing you that until Lake Mead makes substantial recovery, the United States will not be in a position to offer storage credit energy for sale. The time of such recovery cannot be forecast. However, when the reservoir has recovered sufficiently to permit the United States to withdraw storage credit energy, such energy will be disposed of in the manner prescribed by law, and the California-Pacific Utilities Co. will be informed of its possible availability.

Very truly yours,
FRED G. AANDAH, L,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KUCHEL. I point that out to underline the fact that there is now a shortage of water in Lake Mead which has required the Government of the United States to curtail the production of power at Hoover Dam. Is there any wonder why the more than 6 million people in southern California are alarmed over the implication of this bill?

When Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, was testifying on Senate bill 500, as reported on page 26 of the printed hearings, I asked him the following question:

Senator KUCHEL. Why are you curtailing the use of the water now at Hoover Dam?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Because we have had low run over the past year or so, and we have had to save that water so it can be utilized at the proper time as the first priority calls for it to be used.

Senator KUCHEL. Assume that low runoff period with the Glen Canyon Dam constructed; what would be your guide lines in determining how much water to send from Glen Canyon Dam down to Lee Ferry?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. The contracts and commitments of the United States in the lower basin, which include the Republic of Mexico, the various irrigation and municipal uses in the lower basin.

Senator KUCHEL. When you say the contracts, you would include the Colorado River compact, obviously.

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes; that is the provision for the development.

Let me now invite the attention of the Senate to page 10, line 12 of the bill, where we find the following language:

After repayments to the United States of all money required to be paid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

It is to the credit of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], a distinguished member of our committee, that he raised a question as to where the money should go after repayment had been effected. That is an important question. A different yardstick was applied when Boulder Canyon Dam was authorized by the Congress. Then the Congress did not provide that moneys for repayment should go to the lower basin, or to any State in the lower basin. The Congress then provided that the money should go into a special account to be expended for the advancement of the entire Colorado River Basin, not half of it, not the lower basin alone, but all of it.

In the authorization by Congress later on of Parker Dam and Davis Dam, provision is made for revenues, after repayment, to go to the general fund of the Treasury. Why not apply the same yardstick in this bill? Why in this bill should similar revenues benefit only the upper States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from California will remember that the question which arose was whether we should write a new yardstick or whether we should pass the pending legislation, perhaps in the Senate, and then decide if modifying language should not be added to the Boulder Canyon Act, as well as to the law which is now applicable to the Parker and Davis Dams, in order that uniform treatment may be given to all.

I wish to assure the Senator from California that I for one feel myself obligated to follow that pattern. In the case of the Boulder Canyon Act, it has been

seriously contended by Members of the Senate that once the Boulder Canyon Dam project is paid off and the funds have been completely retired, it should belong to the people in the States surrounding it. In other words, it is contended that it should belong to the people of Arizona and Nevada, and perhaps with some rights being given to California, too, because they would have paid most of the money in the form of payments for electric current. The provision now is that it all go into the Treasury.

I am sure that if there had been a provision placed in the act that upon completion the money might be used for additional development within the lower basin, it would have been desirable.

I am merely trying to assure the junior Senator from California that whatever language is finally put into the pending bill, it will be the desire of many of us to bring the language of all such acts into conformity. I do not believe that this project or any project under it should be placed in a preferential position.

The language was put in the bill only because we felt a solution had not been reached in the case of the Boulder Canyon Dam. We have now had 30 years of experience, and are coming within 30 or 40 years of the payout period, and perhaps less than that. The situation that existed when the Boulder Canyon Act was passed has changed materially. I believe if we were to do it again, we might feel differently about the repayment of the money.

I remind the junior Senator from California that at the time the Boulder Canyon Act was passed, a great many people thought the so-called Hoover Dam or Boulder Dam would never pay itself out and that the Government would be stuck with the whole \$165 million, and, furthermore, that there would be no demand for power comparable to that which was anticipated by the proponents of the project. The same experience was had on the Columbia River and elsewhere in the country.

Therefore, taking the experience of 30 years, I believe we should revise the legislation of this character so as to make all of it uniform.

I pledge my assurance that just as soon as there is a demand by the people of Arizona, Nevada, and California for a different deal in the case of Hoover Dam, I shall be glad to see that accomplished.

Mr. KUCHEL. I greatly appreciate the comment of my friend, the Senator from New Mexico. Tomorrow I may wish to suggest to the Senate that the language to which I have just referred be brought in line with the language of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. However I do appreciate the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that all should be treated uniformly so far as the disposition of receipts is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. In that connection I should like to recall to the Senator that in the executive committee hearings on the bill I raised the question whether, in the proposed legislation, the Juniper project was to be authorized in the absence of any requirement whatever

that the Department of the Interior make an administrative finding on feasibility. The Senator from New Mexico, when I called that to his attention, said he agreed that that should not be, and he suggested the change which the committee agreed to.

That is one more evidence of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico is fair. I may disagree with him upon occasion, but no man will deny the fairness of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will also recognize that the Glen Canyon Dam, which would involve \$400 million in the beginning, and would be the largest project, probably would be the first to be constructed if the plans of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have any bearing. It should be remembered that not one drop of water stored behind that dam would be stored for any other purpose than to permit the people of Nevada, Arizona, and California to have the water to which they are entitled under the compact. It is water that is now wasting into the Pacific Ocean.

Therefore, while the bill calls for a substantial sum of money, whatever will be done will be done in furtherance of the Colorado compact, which I know the Senator from California is anxious to see carried out fully at all times.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act now requires \$500,000 a year to be deposited in a special account for the States of the entire Colorado River Basin, and that will continue until 1987. I wonder whether my friend would consider tomorrow joining in the recommendation of an amendment to that particular language in the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from California that there is a reason why the \$500,000 is spent partially in the upper basin States. At the time of the negotiation of the original compact, it was anticipated that the power from the Hoover Dam would be available to all the States. Certain blocks of power were to be sold to Arizona, Colorado, and other States. When the dam was finished, because of the necessities of financing, none of the power was made available in any of those States. Instead of that, money was made available to them. Therefore, there was an exchange, and we would have to bear that in mind if we were to try to take the money away from them. As the work in the upper basin States proceeds, cancellation of that \$500,000, so far as the upper basin States is concerned, may be desirable.

That, however, is a matter about which the officials of the various States may want to be consulted. The day may come when that amount properly should be canceled, as the Government itself takes a larger part of the burden of investigation in the upper Colorado States.

The provision was inserted, as the senior Senator from Colorado and I know—and I was present in Santa Fe when the compact was entered into—because of the statement, which was constantly made, that all the work

which would be done would be done for the Lower Basin States; therefore, some money ought to be made available to investigate the whole stream.

It was wise that it was done that way, and the bill before us is a partial result of those investigations.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I might also point out, in connection with the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico, that much of the power that has been developed at Hoover Dam was developed from water that belonged to the Upper Basin States. We were able to take out only a small amount of that water. The water which ran down into Lake Mead was used to generate power which in theory was emergency power, and California was able to get it at a lower rate. It was able to get it for even less than 2 miles, because of the fact that it was supposed to be emergency power. In actual practice it turned out to be firm power practically all the time. Therefore, when we speak of the \$500,000, it should be remembered that California and the rest of the lower basin area have been fully compensated many times over in the kind of water they have been able to get.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all I wish to do on that point is to suggest that what is considered a fair basis for legislation in the lower basin ought to be considered fair when legislation in the upper basin is considered. We should not have two different yardsticks. Mr. President, we do have two yardsticks in this instance, and we adopt a corrective amendment.

Mr. President, I have not commented thus far on the economics involved in the pending bill. I wish to do that, but I should prefer to do it tomorrow. I believe I have touched upon most of the points this afternoon other than the question of economics. I have tried to do so dispassionately. I have tried to do it on a basis that will be accepted by Members of the Senate as sound.

I recognize my responsibilities as a Member of the Senate. They run to my country and to my State. As a United States Senator with those two types of responsibilities, I wish to help my brethren from the other States of the Union develop their own commonwealths as they should be developed. I do not wish California, which I have the honor to represent along with my able colleague, to have one drop of water more than that to which it is entitled under the law and under the compact. By the same token, Mr. President, I do not wish my State to be deprived of one drop of water to which it is entitled and which is so vital to the continuing growth of the magnificent empire which I call my home.

Because I am convinced that there is in this proposed legislation a direct assault upon the rights of the people of my State, I stand on the floor of the Senate today and urge that Senate to reject this bill.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I should like very briefly to discuss some of the economic aspects involved.

During the delivery of Mr. KUCHEL's speech,

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Will the Senator from California yield so that I may make a speech which will last 30 or 40 minutes, if it is understood that my remarks will appear in the *RECORD* following his remarks?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

WORLD TRIP REPORT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the Armed Services, it is my responsibility to make decisions on many matters every year involving the national security and defense of our country. With the leadership of the free half of the world thrust involuntarily on the shoulders of the United States, the decisions that I make on matters coming before the Committee on the Armed Services involve even more than the security and defense of the United States. They involve the security and defense of all countries allied with the United States. They involve the mutual security and mutual defense of the free half of the world.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my responsibility to make decisions on appropriations involving billions of taxpayers' dollars every year. Those decisions are not only concerned with the objective of the most efficient use of that money and of accomplishing the goals of our country at the least possible cost, but also with the very economic security of our country.

This is particularly the case in my work on two of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee—the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Appropriations—because the great bulk of annual appropriations—thirty-five to forty billion dollars—is first handled in the Senate by subcommittees of which I am a member. In the Senate these subcommittees have the primary responsibility for more than 65 percent of our annual national budget.

How do we make our decisions on matters of such importance and gravity? Principally by the information provided at committee and subcommittee hearings by official representatives of the executive branches and by the supporting printed information they submit, by other witnesses, and by our interrogation of the witnesses appearing before the committees and subcommittees.

SEEING FIRSTHAND

Of course, we have to depend upon the experts in the various fields and be guided by what they tell us. But we are not necessarily limited to such second-hand information, in equipping ourselves for the making of these important decisions. Instead, we can personally seek firsthand information. We can go, and see with our own eyes, hear with our own ears, and feel with our own hands,

what is being done with the billions of dollars that the Appropriations Committee appropriates each year, and with the legislative authorizations that the Armed Services Committee makes each year.

For example, I have gone to make observations in my own home State of Maine, by visiting Air Force bases and naval installations there. Having done this, I was in the position that, when witnesses testified before the committees about these bases and installations, I knew from first-hand, personal inspection what they were talking about. And what I could do in Maine, I could do with respect to places overseas.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

It was with this basic thought in mind that I made 2 overseas trips in the past 6 months, to see for myself about our activities, aid, and policies in foreign countries. While I could have made these trips as a member of either the Appropriations Committee or the Armed Services Committee legitimately at Government expense, I chose to do it on my own; and as a result my two trips were not at Government expense, and did not cost the taxpayers a penny.

My first trip was last October. My second trip was during the latter part of February and the early part of March of this year. Total mileage on the trips was approximately 50,000 covering 23 countries—Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Russia, Finland, Denmark, Spain, Ireland, Japan, Formosa, Philippines, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Greece, and Italy.

CONFERENCES WITH WORLD LEADERS

I shall never forget the experiences of these trips. In them I had the good fortune of having conferences with practically all of the leaders of the major nations of the world. A few of the leaders and prominent people with whom I talked were:

Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Aneurin Bevan, and Arnold Toynbee, in London; Mendes-France, Faure, De Gaulle, Bidault, Monnet, and Mollett, in Paris; Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Nauman, and Saar representatives, in Germany; Molotov, in Moscow; Tani and Tanaka, in Japan; Chiang, in Formosa; Magsaysay and Recto, in Manila; Diem, in Saigon; the British Governor General, in Hong Kong; Prince Wan, in Bangkok; U Nu, in Rangoon; Nehru and Rahdakrishnan, in New Delhi; Mohammed Ali and the King of Jordan, in Karachi; Nasser, in Cairo; Menderes, in Ankara; Scelba, in Rome; and Franco, in Madrid.

MEETINGS WITH LITTLE PEOPLE

I did not confine my conferences and contacts merely to the officials, political leaders, and prominent personages in each country, because I felt that to get a better feel of public attitudes I should go to the little people—to the common, everyday people.

So, in Great Britain, I spent an afternoon with a typical middle-class London family; in Tokyo, an afternoon with a successful Japanese farm family; in France, with a prosperous farm family and with a poor farm family.

In Germany, I took a train through part of East Germany occupied by the Russians, and from the train studied people on the farms; and in East Berlin, I went into the stores.

In Russia, I walked the streets of Moscow, went into the subway, ate in the restaurants, went on a collective farm and talked with the farmers, went to a hospital, went to a grade school.

In Formosa, I went to nurseries, inspected Chinese soldiers in the field, went into a farmer's rice mill, a medical center, a textile mill.

In Vietnam, I spent an afternoon in a dusty, hot refugee camp on the edge of a jungle.

In Thailand, I went to schools and food markets.

In Burma, I met young Burmese children at the United States Information Service Library.

In Manila, I sat in a session of the Philippine Senate during its debate on the Formosa defense issue.

In Hong Kong, I went to a fishing village.

In India, I attended sessions of state legislatures and the national parliament. I passed beggars sleeping on the streets. I visited small villages and attended their community meetings.

In Pakistan, I attended a state dinner.

In Egypt, I visited the slums.

In Turkey I went to schools, visited small villages, and went into the homes of the poor.

In Italy I went to the session of the Italian Parliament when it voted to ratify the western European pacts while Communists were demonstrating outside the Parliament building.

In Spain I drove into the country and into small villages.

These are a few of the things I did. Admittedly they are not enough to make me an expert in the field of foreign relations or international military security. But they surely made me a better informed and more intelligent legislator on security, defense, and foreign relations matters—and surely a better equipped member of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and Foreign Relations.

GOODWILL

Reports from our Embassies credit me with having achieved some goodwill and better understanding for our people and our country in the nations I visited. However, the Communist press of Russia has denounced my travel, calling me an Amazon warmonger hiding behind a rose. Such criticism I welcome, for this denunciation of my trip must mean that I did such a good job for my country that it hurt the Communists enough for them to start screaming about me.

I do not wish to burden the Members of the Senate with details of my trip. Rather, I would give my overall impressions of our position in the world today and of our relations with some of these countries.

PESSIMISM AT TIME OF TRIPS

At the time of my first trip, which was to Europe and Russia, the free half of the world had been shocked by France's rejection of the European De-

I told him that while I had to admit that there was much in what he said, and could understand his confusion, still he should realize that America was a free country, with freedom of speech, and that such contradictory statements were inevitable. I said that was part of the price of freedom in America, but that we would rather pay that price than to be a slave state where there was no freedom of speech.

Third. We are developing a daily-increasing line of strength in southeast Asia from Vietnam on the eastern end to Pakistan on the western end.

Fourth. The weakness in that line is in Vietnam and India, but we are picking up strength in both of those nations.

Fifth. The strength in that line is in the middle of Thailand and on the western end of West Pakistan, where our position is extremely strong.

Sixth. The greatest potential gain is also in the middle of that line in Burma, which could turn to our side before too long. To a lesser extent, there is a similar potential in India.

Seventh. We must recognize that southeast Asia is in a critical and most difficult period of growing independence and self-reliance and that we are handicapped in our relations there by the growing pains of suspicion of our intentions and the mistaken belief of some southeast Asians that communism offers the quickest road to elimination of colonialism and to independence.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

First. The stand-out impressions that I came away with from the Middle East and Mediterranean areas were those with respect to Spain and Turkey.

I think that perhaps some of us in the past have misjudged Spain and Franco. We had misgivings about where Franco and Spain stood during World War II—thinking his neutralism was benevolently for Hitler and Mussolini. Perhaps we misinterpreted what was actually the intense opposition of Franco and Spain to Communist Russia. Today, at least, there is no possibility of misinterpretation about Spain being on our side and against Communist Russia. My conference with Franco increased my belief that our aid to Spain and the establishment of our air bases in Spain are wise investments in security.

I do not understand the attitude of opposition of admission of Spain into NATO. It apparently stems from the fact that Franco was neutral in World War II and seemed to have sympathies with Hitler and Mussolini. I do not like such sympathies—if he did have them. But after all, Western Germany was an active enemy against us under Hitler in World War II—and so was Italy under Mussolini—and yet we have forgiven them and taken them into NATO for mutual-security purposes. If we can do that with former active enemies like Germany and Italy, then why can we not do the same in the interest of real security with a Spain that was not an active enemy but rather a neutralist?

Second. In some respects the biggest inspiration of all that I saw and heard on my trip came in Turkey—that little tough country that neighbors on to Rus-

sia and lives under the very threatening shadow of the giant Russian bear. The Turks have refused to let Russia frighten them. They have refused to be intimidated. They have stood right up to Russia and literally thumbed their noses at, and defied the Communist threats.

Our past aid to Turkey was easily among the smartest and most productive acts we ever took in our foreign policy. It has certainly paid off real dividends in combating the spread of communism in this part of the world where Europe meets Asia.

There is another refreshing thing about the Turks. They do not want any gifts from us. Instead they seek loans which they want to pay back as soon as they can. And they do not want a long-term period of loans—but rather only for the next 5 years or so. After that, they say they will be able to carry their own load and pay us back.

Third. We are developing a daily-increasing line of strength in that area from Turkey on the eastern end to Spain on the western end.

Fourth. The weakness in that line is in the middle, as contrasted to the southeast Asia line where the middle is our strongest area. The weakness is in our position in Egypt to the south, Yugoslavia to the north, Italy and France in the center.

Fifth. The weakness of France and Italy is in the instability of their multi-party systems and their psychology of pushing for American economic aid by talking about the Communist threat.

The bright spot in Italy is Clare Boothe Luce, our Ambassador there. In a policy of polite firmness, she is giving a very effective administration of a law passed by Congress which directs that offshore procurement contracts be taken away from plants that show a trend toward communism—plants where Communist membership among the workers is increasing, however slightly. That offshore procurement policy is paying dividends in fighting communism in Italy. It should be followed more firmly by our representatives in other countries.

Sixth. A promising potential gain is Egypt, in that in her newly acquired independence her leaders are receptive to advice and guidance, provided suspicions about our policy on colonialism and Arab-Israeli relations can be overcome. This is a particularly important potential because of the Afro-Asian conference and attempts to knit Africa and Asia together against the rest of the world.

The Communists have so exploited the issue of colonialism that the leaders of Arab nations have to be very careful in their expressions and acts against the Communists lest they be accused of being the paid puppets of so-called British and American colonialists.

There are two favorable aspects in an otherwise unfavorable situation in Egypt and the Arab States. The first is in the tremendous respect the Arabs have for President Eisenhower. They have no major criticism of him. The second is in what I believe to be the case with Egypt's Prime Minister Nasser. He is feeling his way along. I think that he wants Egypt ultimately to be aligned with

the United States, but feels that he will have to lead his people gradually away from their suspicions about American foreign policy being designed to take over where Britain leaves off on colonialism.

Seventh. I think that in this area we must recognize that our strength is dependent upon the very will and determination of each nation; that Turkey and Spain show the greatest will and determination, and therefore merit our aid and support the most; that France and Italy show less determination and will, but that part of their lack of firmness and response stems from our own lack of firmness on such matters as offshore procurement policy; that Egypt in its uncertain steps of national "childhood" can be developed into an ally.

EISENHOWER RAISES AMERICAN PRESTIGE

I am glad to report, from what I saw and heard, that American prestige abroad is no longer on the wane. It may have been a year or two ago, but not now. To the contrary, it is going up. And I think this is largely because President Eisenhower in the last few months has begun to exercise real leadership.

I saw a difference in reaction on this attitude abroad between the time of my trip in October, when repeatedly people said to me that they wished President Eisenhower would give the world more vigorous leadership, that they were almost hungry for him to do so, and that they would quickly follow, and my trip in February, when I found that the attitude had changed. Now people in the various countries are inspired by the manner in which President Eisenhower has been asserting world leadership. They want him to continue to do it, and in even greater degree. It has done much to build up their courage to resist the threat of communism.

LEADERSHIP MUST INCREASE

That leadership must increase in boldness and firmness in the future if we are to cope successfully with the threat to the freedom of the world.

In spite of the pessimism that prevails in some circles, we have plenty to be thankful for and confident about. Our strength, prestige, and position in the defense against the aggressive advances of the Communists is greater than we realize and is gradually increasing. While we are gaining, we still have a great deal to do and we cannot let up in our alertness and vigilance.

I have heard the State Department and its employees attacked time and again, but I want to say that I am proud of the personnel in our Foreign Service. They are doing a real, patriotic, and effective job for our country.

One of the principal criticisms I have about the State Department is leaving such key ambassadorships as those to India and Burma vacant and unfilled for so long. This, I believe, is inexcusable. Another criticism is the failure to recognize the necessity of having career personnel in the top spots.

NEEDED CHANGES IN FOREIGN POLICY

The time has come when there should be some changes in at least the approaches of our foreign policy. We should stop trying to force our aid on

countries. Our policy should be to let nations ask for our aid rather than to attempt to force it on them. We should give more aid in the form of loans on a businesslike basis than in the form of gifts. Such a policy will not only provide wiser investment in truly mutual security, but will breed greater respect for us. We should concentrate more of our aid in those countries on whom we can depend.

ACT FROM CONFIDENCE INSTEAD OF FEAR

Every American should be made to realize that the cold war is something that we will have to cope with for many, many years—perhaps decades—perhaps for the rest of our lives. Even so, cold war is preferable to hot war.

The time has come when the very basis of our foreign policy must change. It must shift from the past negative basis of fear—fear of Russia—to a positive basis of confidence in ourselves and nations friendly to us. We have every reason for confidence in ourselves. We are the greatest nation in the world. If we do not have confidence in ourselves then surely we cannot expect other countries to have confidence in us.

The free, liberty-loving nations of the world must stop living in fear and acting from fear. We must act from confidence. We cannot accomplish our goal of peace if we continue to think in terms of fear of Russia.

I believe that we must start charting our course on the basis that we are not going to let Russia scare us any more; that we are plenty capable of taking care of ourselves; and that we must strive for positive construction instead of fear minded, negative defensiveness.

CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

During the delivery of Mr. KUCHEL's speech,

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield with the understanding that the Senator's remarks will appear at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, when a former President of the United States undertakes to attack his successor, it behooves him to check up on his own history. Mr. Harry Truman's speech last Saturday evening was a sorry attempt to revive the name-calling, inflammatory methods used by one element of the Democratic Party in years gone by. Fortunately, the American people have learned to evaluate this technique, and its value today is zero.

Mr. Truman declared that President Eisenhower has been "playing partisan politics with our security, with our foreign policy, with our civil service, and with our Nation's resources." These charges come with peculiar grace from a former President who threw American military forces into war without consulting Congress, who froze thousands of temporary employees into permanent civil-service tenure, and whose administration was marked by a series of the most shocking scandals in our history.

I prefer to believe that the bitterness of our former President is based upon the amazing contrast between the Washington atmosphere under Truman and the Washington atmosphere under Eisenhower.

Irresponsible criticism is a luxury which our country cannot afford in these perilous times. I am certain that the overwhelming majority of American people look at President Eisenhower through the eyes of another spokesman of the Democratic Party, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN said: "Our hearts go out to President Eisenhower as in terrible loneliness he wrestles with the problems of life and death that confront the Nation."

Americans are accustomed to the extremes of partisan debate. We have learned to take them with more than a grain of salt, but in these troubled times, we can stand a moratorium on political oratory designed to confuse the mind and comfort the enemy.

President Eisenhower is not the one who reduced the dollar to a 50-cent piece.

President Eisenhower is not the one who increased the national debt from \$21 billion in 1932 to \$267 billion in 1951 to \$277,600,000,000 in 1955.

President Eisenhower is not the one who increased the cost of Government from \$5 billion in 1932 to \$74 billion in 1952.

President Eisenhower is not the one who recognized Soviet Russia.

President Eisenhower is not the one who coddled Alger Hiss, let Gerhardt Eisler escape, and blocked every effort to smoke Communists out of Government.

President Eisenhower is not the one who made the disastrous agreements at Yalta.

President Eisenhower is not the one whose blundering policy lost China to the Reds.

President Eisenhower is not the one who ordered the "police action" in Korea.

President Eisenhower is not the one who fired General MacArthur.

President Eisenhower is not the one who has brought us a spurious prosperity through war and by mortgaging the future through debt.

President Eisenhower is not the one whose extravagance and fiscal policy have brought on inflation, and then has cried to high heaven for greater authority to bring on more of the same to stop inflation.

President Eisenhower is the leader of the party which has made it so hot for the former administration that they were forced to order crime investigations; but he is not the one whose political connections with the underworld have been revealed by the same investigations.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY OF REPORT BY HIM TOMORROW TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as a courtesy to the Senate, I desire to make an announcement.

The former Gillette committee, as the Senate knows, was concerned with McCARTHY's finances for a number of years, as were also the Watkins committee and the special session of the Senate last year.

The Internal Revenue Service has just completed a 3-year investigation of a 7-year period. In view of the amount of money which has been spent on the investigation by the two committees, and the time spent during the special session, I feel I owe an obligation to the American people to give them a detailed report of what the Internal Revenue Service has discovered after a 3-year field investigation.

Therefore, tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock I shall make a report, not to the Senate, but to the American people, by way of the press, in a press conference.

I felt that as a matter of courtesy I should let the Senate know that the report would be made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. CLEVELAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Sen-

ator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield without his losing his right to the floor, so as to permit me to place 2 statements in the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement entitled "The Origin and Characteristics of the Colorado River and the Colorado River Storage Project," and a statement entitled "Western Water Law and the Colorado River Storage Project."

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLORADO RIVER AND THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The United States is blessed with 10 great river systems providing water for consumptive use, power generation, and irrigation. Of these, the Colorado has for months been the topic of discussion in the press, on the radio, and in the hall of Congress where legislation relating to its control, development, and use have been under consideration since 1954. Approval of this legislation will make possible the full utilization of the Colorado River, provide the water and power necessary to maximum, municipal, agricultural, industrial, power and recreational development and make the beginning of 100 years of round, consistent, and economic growth in the four upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming).

The Colorado River drains parts of seven States in the arid West where water is literally the lifeblood of the economy. The States are California, Nevada, and anyone in the lower basin and Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming in the upper basin.

The Colorado is a unique river. It is long and crooked. It rises in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming and after dropping swiftly down its numerous tributaries, which drain the snow-capped peaks, it enters a deep gorge which cuts through the Colorado plateau for several hundred miles. This gorge is often more than 3,000 feet deep with nearly vertical side walls. Along this stretch of the river there is little usable land and few people. Getting the water out of the river and transporting it to the irrigable, populated valleys through this section of the river is impossible. After the river leaves the deep canyon section near Toposh, Ariz., diversions of water for irrigation are possible and several such divisions were made late in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century. The diversion works, however, were subject to frequent damaging floods which seriously limited irrigation development. On the upper tributaries of the river many small diversions were made during the same period. These too were limited by the difficulty of

controlling the widely fluctuary flow of the river.

The Colorado River is a snow-fed stream. Its origin is in the great snow blanket which accumulates each winter on the high watersheds of the Colorado River drainage basin. This snow blanket is a huge natural reservoir the outlet of which cannot be controlled by man. The snow melts with the rising temperature in the spring and the rapidity and duration of rise of the temperature together with the extent and water content of the snow cover determines the waterflow. Contrary to indications in eastern streams precipitation falling as rain, being a minor part of the total annual precipitation, has little effect on the flow of the Colorado River. The lower elevations in the Colorado Drainage Basin are extremely arid and contribute very little to the total flow of the river. The lower basin (Arizona, Nevada, and California) being at low elevation contribute only 10 percent of the total flow of the river which the upper basin (Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming) containing most of the high watersheds and the heavy snow pack produce 90 percent of the total flow. In fact California produces none of the waters of the Colorado and Nevada very little.

Depending solely on a precipitation (rain or snow) which varies widely from year to year and on an unpredictable temperature, the flow of the Colorado varies widely from month to month and from year to year. This wild, unruly river, which defied the efforts of man to control it up to the time the Hoover Dam was built, varied from a virgin low flow at Yuma, Ariz., of 1,200 cfs to a virgin high flow of 300,000 cfs.

The maximum development of water source of this kind, which varies widely and is difficult to control, is limited to its low water flow without storage for regulation. Prior to 1920 the low water flow was fully appropriated and put to use and continued development but in the upper basin and the lower basin began to impinge upon existing rights. This situation prompted the development and signing of the Colorado River compact which divided the waters of the river between the upper and lower Basin States prior to its being put to use.

This compact by itself had no effect on the flow characteristics of the river but it provided a basin for the development of necessary physical controls which would effect the flow characteristics. Shortly after the Colorado River compact was signed the Hoover Dam was proposed and by 1935 it was completed and the Colorado River below the dam was under complete control. This control made possible the full and complete use of the waters allocated to the lower basin.

Since the completion of the Hoover Dam the Parker and Davis Dams, in the lower basin, have been completed for the purpose of generating power, the All American Heading and Canal have been completed to deliver water to the Imperial Valley and authorization to build the Pilot Knob power plant on the All-American Canal has been granted.

This power plant will discharge water into the Colorado River just above the Mexican border where it will be of no further use to the United States. The construction of the Hoover Dam and other facilities in the lower basin has completely changed the flow characteristics in the lower basin and made possible the full use of this water and power resource, not only that which the Colorado River compact allocates to the lower basin, but the entire flow that passes the Hoover Dam.

But what about the Colorado River above Lee Ferry? In the 32 years since the signing of the compact, except for the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion and a few other very small projects, nothing has

happened except investigations. These investigations, costing between \$7 and \$10 million have been thorough and exacting. These investigations show that no further development is possible in the upper Colorado River Basin without storage for regulation of the river. Based on these investigations, a proposed plan for the control and utilization of the waters allocated to the upper Colorado River Basin under the Colorado River compact has been made. This plan when carried out will completely control the river and make possible the beneficial consumptive use of the water allocated to the upper Colorado River States by the compact, the generation of power which will provide revenues for the repayment of the power costs with interest and have left over revenues to help pay the irrigation costs all within 50 years and then yield a net annual revenue of millions of dollars for public benefit.

Legislation relating to this project is now before the Congress. Its approval means the control of the Colorado River for the benefit of the people by providing water and power for the agricultural, industrial, and municipal development in the upper basin States and constitutes an investment in the future for this Nation.

WESTERN WATER LAW AND THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Colorado River storage project legislation now pending before the Congress presents another forward step in the development of the Nation's land and water resources. It involves a planned basinwide development supported by a compact agreed to by the United States and the seven Colorado River basin States. This compact departs from the basic principles of western water law in that it divides up the water resources before it is put to use in order that the areas that, due to physical or other handicaps, develop more slowly will not lose their share of the water to those who could and would put it to use first.

The first law relating to waters to be established in the United States was based on the common law of England and is known as the doctrine of riparian rights. It is a humid area law because it does not depend upon nor has any relation to the consumptive use of water. In effect it says a man owning land on the bank of a stream has a right to have the water in that stream flow by his land undiminished in quantity and unpolluted in quality for all time by virtue of his ownership of the land. Use of the water does not create a right and nonuse does not forfeit it. It did not permit a consumptive of water. A man owning land not abutting on the stream has no rights whatsoever in the stream. This doctrine still remains the basis law in the humid areas.

When the arid West was settled it became apparent from the first that consumptive use must be the basis of the right and inasmuch as there was never enough water to satisfy all needs the principles of first in time is first in right, became established. Thus a new doctrine of water law was born. It is called the doctrine of appropriation: "First in time is first in right and beneficial use is the basis and the measure of the right." The Intermountain States (Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona), from the first abrogated the doctrine of riparian rights and accepted the doctrine of appropriation. The other Western States (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, California, Oregon, Washington, and Montana) retained the doctrine of riparian rights but have since so modified it by statute and court decisions that the basic water law of these States is practically the doctrine of appropriation. The principle of beneficial use is paramount in the States signing the Colorado River

compact with some modification in California and is recognized as between States. Furthermore, the State contributions provide in most States, and only a right to use can be acquired.

The Colorado River, being a wild and unruly stream, subject to wide variations in flow, and traveling rugged topography developed slowly. The early users of water in the lower basin had appropriated the entire low-water flow. Development on the tributaries in the upper basin began to effect the low-water flow in the lower basin. Water users on both basins became fearful of their rights based on priority of use and proposed a compact which would circumvent the doctrine of appropriation and divide the waters of the river between the States in advance of its use. Thus was born the Colorado River compact now accepted as the basic law of the river. Under the compact use does not establish the right nor does nonuse forfeit it.

The law of gravity, however, operates in spite of the compact. Since the signing of the compact facilities have been constructed in the lower basin to permit the use of the entire flow of the river for consumptive use and power generation. Already water belonging to the upper Colorado River States, but not being used because there are no facilities for storage, diversion, and conveyance, is being used in the lower basin to generate power which is now supporting industrial and domestic users in the lower basin. They will probably not establish a right by such use in spite of the compact but continued for power and a developed consumptive use on lower basin lands would make it difficult if not impossible to secure an authorization to build facilities in the upper basin if such action would destroy developed uses in the lower basin.

It is therefore apparent that nonuse in the upper basin for an indefinite period would result, practically, in the loss of the right given by the Colorado compact. Such nonuse will be forced on the upper-basin States if the facilities proposed in the Colorado River storage project are not authorized.

Inasmuch as water runs downhill, failure to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project under the same ground rules as have been afforded other reclamation projects will be tantamount to giving away the water and power resources of the upper basin States to the States of the lower Colorado River Basin and Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of real regret that I take the floor to oppose the upper Colorado project. My feeling of regret is due largely to the esteem and affection which I have for the Senators from the States in the upper Colorado Basin; notably the Senators from Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, but of course, not excluding the Senators from Arizona and Nevada. I am aware that the bill means a great deal to them individually as representatives of their States; and I am aware that it means a great deal to the States themselves.

THE BILL AND ITS EFFECTS

The bill calls for the expenditure of \$1,658,460,000, as the report on pages 16 and 17 shows. But this, as I shall show, is only the beginning, because it has been the past record of the Bureau of Reclamation that the actual costs are more than twice the originally estimated costs.

It is also true that the interest upon the irrigation features of the project, for which the construction costs will be approximately \$915 million, is forgiven;

and ultimately the taxpayers themselves will have to pay the interest on the bonds which will have to be floated. This will amount, probably, to \$1,153,000,000, according to Mr. S. W. Crosthwait, Acting Commissioner of the Department of Interior as given in his letter on page 555 of the hearings on S. 500.

Lurking behind the project which are authorized in the bill are additional projects, the magnitude of which we cannot guess, but which we can be quite certain will be very great indeed. Among these will be the completion of the central Utah project.

So the bill before the Senate provides for direct and indirect expenditures of \$2,750,000,000, and probably substantial sums will be required in addition to that amount.

The direct outlay of over \$1,600,000,000 in the upper Colorado River region, distributed over an area roughly shown by the map I hold in my hand, will, of course, result in a great deal of employment in that area. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of persons will be employed in constructing the dams, laying out the irrigation projects, and installing the generators. This will have a very stimulative effect upon the trade and industries of the region.

Furthermore, the acres to be irrigated, even though at a high cost, will, increase the population of the region and will be of economic benefit to it. So I am quite well aware of the interest which the people of those four States take in the proposed legislation, and of the obligation which the Senators from those States feel, in a sense, as ambassadors from their States to defend the interests of their localities.

BURDEN BORNE BY THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Mr. President, if this were all to the story, I would, of course, support the measure. But I cannot do so, because it is not all. Whence will the money come with which to pay for the projects? It will certainly have to be advanced by the country as a whole. The States to be affected will, in their payment of taxes, contribute only about 2 percent of the amount which will be invested. If it should happen that the national deficit will be increased, as will probably be the case, bonds will have to be floated. But the interest on those bonds will have to be met by the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole. Further it looks as though the principal does not go back in the Treasury but is to be used for more irrigation projects. Therefore, the bill is not a matter of concern merely to the States immediately affected.

In my opinion, too often in these matters we turn the issues over to the States which will be benefited, and which naturally wish to have representation on the committees which deal with them, while the Senators from the other States of the Union largely wash their hands and take what the States immediately interested decide upon. But obviously the burden ultimately has to be borne by the Nation as a whole.

I have great affection not only for the Senators from the four States concerned, and the neighboring States, but

also for the Senators from the great northern tier of States—Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and the upper New England area. They are all fine members, and their localities could also be benefited if Congress appropriated over \$1.6 billion with which to erect hot-houses in which to grow bananas and luscious strawberries. Think of the employment which would be created in those regions if Congress decided, as a public project, to grow bananas in the wintertime, and thus alleviate the shortage of fruit. Prosperity would bloom throughout the northern area. But someone else would have to pay the bill.

As I recall Benjamin Franklin, in his Autobiography, described how he used to walk along the waterfront of Boston. One day, as he was walking, a hawker approached him and asked him to buy a whistle. Franklin wanted a whistle, so he bought the one which the hawker offered. Later he found that he had paid about five times too much for the whistle, and he repented his purchase for the rest of his life. Franklin said that ever afterward, when he contemplated making an expenditure, he asked himself, "Did you pay too much for the whistle?" I think perhaps that was the only time in his life when Franklin made an imprudent purchase.

In connection with the projects under consideration, the Federal Government and the people of the entire country will be committed to uneconomic expenditures, which will largely be borne by other sections than those directly benefited. Granted that it is fine to generate electricity from water power and to develop irrigation projects; granted that it is fine to see the desert blossom as the rose; nevertheless, the question today is, just as it was in the time of Franklin, "Are we paying too much for the project? Are we paying too much for the whistle?" The money spent on these projects in a normal period must be withdrawn from other purposes. The taxes which the taxpayers pay decrease the amount of money which they can spend for their private purposes. The interest which the taxpayers will pay upon the bonds to be floated will diminish their incomes and decrease their purchases.

THE GOOD OF THE NATION SHOULD BE THE YARDSTICK

We can foresee the expansion of employment in the four upper Colorado Basin States, but we cannot calculate the precise decrease in purchasing power and the decrease in employment in the regions which will pay the taxes. As a Senator from an industrial State, one of the "conquered provinces" of the Nation which have very little voice in the Senate of the United States, or, if they have a voice, very little effect upon the processes of legislation, I am of the opinion that we should look at this question from the standpoint of what is good for the country as a whole. How can the labor and the purchasing power which we have be used most advantageously? Is what is proposed the best use of the money and the labor we have to furnish? If it is, we should pass the bill. If it is not, we should reject it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois has ever visited the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I have.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did he find there automobiles made in Detroit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did he find products from all over the United States being used there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that, as I remember, the Salt River Valley was almost the first of the irrigation projects. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the water not come from the Roosevelt Dam?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Roosevelt Dam, I think, was the first large-scale dam constructed to impound water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not at the moment making an attack on all irrigation projects. In fact, I think the early irrigation projects were beneficial. The cost was low, the land which was irrigated was fertile, the growing seasons were long, and I think those projects were desirable. My point is that on the upper Colorado—and I hope to develop this point—there is a short growing season, cost per acre are enormous, benefits per acre will be comparatively low, and what is projected is not a good way to spend such enormous amounts of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say that I shall be happy to hear the Senator's discussion. I merely want to point out that a very natural thing happened with regard to irrigation projects. The best and the most available dam sites were used first. Subsequently it was difficult to find additional dam sites. I think that if the Senator will compare the growing season where the pending projects are located with the growing season in the Grand Coulee Dam area, he will find that the areas embraced in the Columbia River projects do not have a much longer growing season than do the areas where the projects contemplated by the pending bill are located. He will find in those areas projects which have worked out extremely well, and have turned out to be of value to the country generally.

As I hope to develop in a short time, if we do not continue to develop these projects to be used for the production of food for the people of the United States, people who live in States like Illinois may a little later confront more problems than they might have from the competition they are anticipating in connection with these projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New Mexico that if money is spent on an uneconomic project, it is taken away from other portions of the country, and their purchasing power is diminished. The Senator may be able to say that there would be more automobiles in New Mexico, Colorado,

or Utah, but there would be fewer automobiles in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

ARE ADDITIONAL ACRES NECESSARY?

There is one final point I should like to make with respect to the argument that it is now necessary to have large amounts of additional land put under cultivation. At the moment the cry is intended to withdraw land from cultivation. Wheat acreage is being cut by 20 million acres. The Secretary of Agriculture wanted to have the cultivation of other crops cut by 20 million more acres, and to have withdrawn from cultivation 40 million acres which were, to be put into grass and nitrogen fixing legumes. So at the moment the desire is not for additional units of land to be put under cultivation; it is quite the contrary. It is said we have a surplus of land under cultivation, and that some of it should be withdrawn from cultivation.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we were legislating for the moment, I grant that what the Senator has said would be correct; but if we are trying to legislate for the future, even 15 years from now, I think the Senator will not then find land will be withdrawn from cultivation. I shall demonstrate later this afternoon that before the proposed projects are completed, we will be a have-not nation agriculturally; and it is for that reason that I desire to have the proposed legislation enacted, and not for the advantage of the moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is a much better expert on the subject of agriculture than I am, since he was once Secretary of Agriculture, and was a very distinguished official in that role. However, I may say that I think we are going to find that there will be a continued increase in output per acre, and that such continued increase in output per acre in the fertile sections of the country will largely remove the necessity for putting under cultivation the less fertile, semi-arid, and arid regions of the Nation.

I might mention one final point. Probably the greatest authority on the geography of the country is Mr. Paul Sears, who was once a professor in Oklahoma, then in Ohio, and I believe is now at Yale. He has pointed out that if we really want to increase farm output, the thing to do is to put more water on the fertile sections of the country, on the land of Iowa, on the land of Illinois, on the land of Indiana, on the land of Ohio—and, yes, on the land of Minnesota—at much less expense than would be involved in the pending legislation, not \$800 an acre, but somewhere between \$30 and \$60 an acre. That is, water would be taken from the Mississippi, from the Great Lakes, or from other great rivers of the country, would be put on land which is fertile, at much lower costs, and the land would produce a much larger yield, and it would pay off.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know of Paul Sears and of his book *Deserts on the*

March, and other works of that nature. I agree there is much in what he has said. It will gladden the heart of the Senator from Illinois to know that in the delta of the Mississippi, one of the greatest agricultural areas of the country, irrigation is today starting to be practiced.

The Senator referred to land which is designated as fertile. I want the Senator to remember, and I am sure he knows this well, that there are many areas of the country where land is not regarded as particularly fertile, but where the light, sandy soil is easily adapted to the growing of crops.

It is interesting to note that the proposal which has been made to bring water from the Mississippi Valley to the high plains of Texas would involve cost far in excess of that contemplated for the pending project, yet a cost which the country would be prepared to pay, because it would be the only course by which it would be possible to feed the population of this country.

I intend to deal with the question that merely by increasing the fertility of our present cultivated lands we will not be able to feed our increasing population and maintain our present standard of living, to say nothing of improving it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not proposing that the waters of the Mississippi River should be shipped overland a thousand miles to Texas; but I do say that for an acreage cost of one-twentieth of the cost contemplated by the pending bill, we will be enabled to obtain a greater output of farm production by putting water on already fertile land, than by carrying on this project on the Colorado, and putting water on very high land where the growing season is short.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield, Mr. President. Today, I seemed to have stirred up the lions, as usual. I hope to proceed with my speech, but meanwhile I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not of the types that are in surplus supply?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am quite well aware that this project will provide for the raising of feed for livestock—in other words, for the raising of hay and a little corn. This project will not result in the rich yields which are obtained in certain sections of Arizona or southern California. Instead, this project is primarily—insofar as its agricultural phases are concerned—for the purpose of providing feed for livestock; and I say that is about the most unprofitable use which could be made of irrigated land.

Mr. WATKINS. That depends upon the section involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have studied the reports for each and every one of these ir-

rigation projects; and in each and every case the Bureau of Reclamation, which certainly is not prejudiced against this product, since it is its baby, says that primarily the project is for the production of hay and other livestock feed.

Mr. WATKINS. In some sections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In virtually every section.

Mr. WATKINS. In some of the high sections of Colorado and elsewhere, but not everywhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know the altitude of Salt Lake or of the beautiful section in the Wasatch Mountains; but on the profile map, the altitudes are between 5,000 and 7,000 feet above sea level; and, inevitably, that means a short-growing season.

Mr. WATKINS. In Salt Lake Valley we cannot use irrigated land for the growing of feed for livestock. We do not attempt to raise hay, grain, or oats on the land made available by these projects. Most of the water which will come from this dam will be for industrial use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator from Utah is shifting to industrial use. But I am talking about irrigation. I say that insofar as irrigated land is concerned, this project is about of the least possible value; and the proof is that the landowners are supposed to pay only about 15 percent of the cost of these projects.

Mr. WATKINS. The landowners are also the power users.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are not identical with the power users.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all power users.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But not in the same proportion.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all in the same community, and they are cooperating to build these projects. That is the only way by which we could build these projects. All the people—both those on the farms and those in the cities—cooperate to build these projects. All of them are willing to pay the costs for power in the same area; all of them are willing to pay enough to retire all the expenditures for construction. The only part which would not be retired with interest would be the part allocated to irrigation. The principal would be repaid, but not the interest.

If the Senator from Illinois wishes to check on these projects, I shall undertake to show exactly what happens, namely, that the benefits coming from these projects are sufficient—on the basis of comparing construction costs with the benefits—to justify them; and the benefits are sufficient to pay for all the costs, but not including interest, after they have been in operation for, let us say, 10 years.

That is the actual history of these projects. One of the worst of them, I think, is the Seedskaadee, in Wyoming, where the irrigated land has been used for production of the type of crops the Senator from Illinois has been mentioning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will examine the hearings beginning on page 59 and con-

tinuing for approximately 25 pages, he will find that in virtually every one of the projects the analysis shows that the primary production is that of crops for the feeding of livestock. My point is that of course in the past, irrigation projects have not been used for this purpose because they are uneconomical when so used; but now it is proposed to use the water for this purpose—about the most uneconomical use one could imagine.

IRRIGATION FEATURES ARE NOT SELF-SUPPORTING

Furthermore, the irrigation features of the project do not stand on all fours; there will have to be more surplus for power; and I shall point out that it is possible and, to my mind, probable, that the surplus for power will not be sufficient to meet the irrigation costs, and that therefore not only will the interest on the irrigation costs have to be met by the taxpayers—and that will mean at least \$1,153,000,000—but that also the principal of the irrigation cost itself will have to be met by the taxpayers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, we shall show to the contrary. The history of these projects shows that they have been beneficial.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course if the rest of the country pours money into a certain area, that area can be made prosperous. But the purchasing power which is withdrawn from the other sections of the country—

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the benefits which come from the development make it possible for the other sections of the country to be more prosperous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if the money had stayed in the other sections of the country, it would have built up employment and purchasing power still further in those areas.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention—as we have done over the years—to the flood-control program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if my good friend, the Senator from Utah, will permit me to do so, I should like to develop my argument. I am trying to make an introduction to it. Then I shall speak of power, and then of irrigation; and then I shall take up the reserve water supply; and then I shall say a few words about recreation. But I do not wish to be drawn immediately into a discussion of flood control.

Let me say that I have been down into the valley of the Colorado, as a great many others have been. I walked down there and I walked back and I got very sore walking there. I have camped in the deep gorge of the Grand Canyon. There are no great industrial settlements in that canyon, and there is no danger of flooding farms or industries there. The problem on the Colorado is entirely different from the problem on the Columbia or on other rivers on the banks of which there are great industries.

The Senator from Utah knows this region. It is where a great river flows through a series of deep canyons—beautiful canyons, awe-inspiring canyons.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say that for many years my home was on one of the

large tributaries of the Colorado. I have been up and down it, more or less, and am acquainted with it from New Mexico to the headwaters, in Wyoming. I say, Mr. President, that there are no great industries on the river itself because the river is crooked and for most part flows through deep canyons; and we have to spend money to bring the water from the river to the farms where it is needed, and also to take the water over a mountain range to Los Angeles and that area.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we could build hot houses in northern Maine and northern Minnesota, and in them could grow bananas and strawberries, and that would seem at first blush to be a fine thing. But the question is whether it would be an economical expenditure of funds. That is all I ask.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, that the people out west are grand people. The outdoor life has a splendid effect on their character. But they cannot expect to do with about 14,000,000 acre-feet of water a year what they could do if they had 140,000,000 acre-feet of water a year.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course that is simple arithmetic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is too bad that these fine people live in a semi-arid region, with a river running through deep canyons. We are sorry for them, but I do not think that creates for them a perpetual claim on the public treasury.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask about flood control. The Senator from Illinois lives in an area which itself could take care of its rivers if it wished to do so. Why should the rest of the Nation pay millions of dollars for flood control on those streams, in view of the fact that those expenditures are not of direct benefit to the people in the other States? It is just the opposite.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah is well aware of the fact that I have not been a very ardent advocate of the rivers and harbors bills and the so-called flood-control projects. I think probably more land has been reclaimed by the Army engineers than by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. That is not surprising. They spend a great deal more money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What happens in those cases is that the stream is deepened, the water is drained off from the swamplands, levees are constructed, and land which was swampland and virtually useless has bulldozers turned onto it, and, at slight cost, what was worthless land becomes extremely valuable land.

Mr. WATKINS. And the landowners do not pay any of the cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois once proposed that half the cost of the improvements should be paid by special assessments upon the land benefited.

Mr. WATKINS. Why did not the Senator go all the way?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to go all the way. Will the Senator from Utah agree to support any effort in that direction, and vote for it?

Mr. WATKINS. If a different rule is set up for reclamation, I certainly will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But two wrongs do not make a right. We are not dealing now with rivers and harbors, or with the Mississippi River or the Missouri River. We are dealing with the upper Colorado River, and I would appreciate it if the Senator from Utah would let me discuss it, instead of bringing in extraneous issues which have nothing to do with the case. "The flowers that bloom in the spring, tra-la," as Gilbert and Sullivan wrote, "have nothing to do with the case."

Mr. WATKINS. In 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 the appropriations for flood control were \$2,587,112,298, none of which was returned to the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Army engineers' bill comes before the Senate, I am perfectly willing to discuss it, and I hope my good friend from Utah will "man the pumps" on that occasion. But for the moment, let us discuss the pending bill, namely, Senate bill 500, which deals with the upper Colorado project.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator from Illinois "man the pumps" last year when the flood-control annual authorization was before us?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I would give the new administration a year to see if it would not reform, and I was ill. But no, it is just as bad as ever.

Mr. WATKINS. Just as bad as previous administrations which have been inaugurating flood-control projects through the years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. There has been no improvement.

ACTUAL COSTS WILL EXCEED ESTIMATES

If I may return to the subject, what is the upper Colorado project? In the first place, it calls for an expenditure of \$1,658,460,100, of which \$915 million is allocated to irrigation, \$656.6 million to power, and \$72 million to municipal water. In all probability, the actual cost of these projects will be greatly in excess of the estimated cost. I hold in my hand a report from the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives in the 82d Congress, entitled "The Civil Functions Program of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army." It is House Committee Print No. 21. There is also in the report a section on the Bureau of Reclamation. On pages 17 and 18 it is pointed out that in the case of the Corps of Engineers, the actual cost of 182 projects exceeded the estimated cost by 124 percent from the time they were initially considered in Congress. That is to say, if the Corps of Engineers estimated the cost to be \$1 million, the actual cost, on the average, would be \$2,240,000.

The Bureau of Reclamation was not quite as bad as that, but the actual costs of the projects studied exceeded the estimated costs by 106 percent. That is to say, if the Bureau of Reclamation estimated the cost at \$1 million, the actual cost would prove to be \$2,060,000. In other words, the past record of the Bureau of Reclamation has been that it understates the final cost by at least one-half of the final cost. Interestingly

enough, the report states that the present estimated cost of the Missouri River program is approximately 274 percent greater than the figure used at the time the project was approved by Congress. For example, if the estimate had been \$100 million—of course, it was much more than that—it now appears that the cost will be \$374 million.

Therefore, when a project comes before us with respect to which it is admitted that the costs will be \$1,658,460,100, in view of the past record, I think we can be fairly certain that the actual costs will be greatly in excess of that amount.

I may say in this connection that only about 30 percent of the added cost of the projects studied by the Public Works Committee was due to changes in the price levels. Forty-three percent was due to structural changes. Having had some experience with public works on a local and State scale, I can say that that is a phrase which is used to cover a multitude of sins. A slight change in plans can be made, to justify a huge increase in cost.

Approximately 27 percent was for other reasons, such as structural engineering modifications, changed local needs, unforeseen conditions, inadequacy in planning, administrative decision, and so forth. So I think we can be certain that we are not only being let in for \$1,658,460,100 of capital expenditures, but for what may run into \$2, \$2½, or \$3 billion worth of capital construction costs.

In addition, there is the interest factor, which is quite important. On power projects capital costs are repaid, and interest costs are repaid. That, I think, is as it should be. I believe that interest is a true and proper charge. In the case of irrigation projects capital costs are repaid, but not interest. In the case of land redeemed from flooding, as the Senator from Utah said, neither the capital cost nor the interest charges are repaid. I think we need a real reform in connection with such expenditures. In the past the Senator from Illinois has advocated such a reform. I was almost alone in such advocacy, I may say. I hope that when the Senator from Illinois brings forward such a proposal again, he will have the support of the senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Last year I thought probably the Senator would bring forward such a proposal, after he told me he was introducing a bill requiring payment of half the costs, but, as I gather from the record, I do not think the Senator from Illinois raised the question, and, as I remember the record, he did not even vote on the legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was not in good health during the concluding days of the session last year, and was in bed a great deal of the time, so he missed a number of the late rollcalls, although his attendance record in general has been very good, name-

ly over 90 percent. I am sure the Senator from Utah does not wish to criticize the Senator from Illinois because at that period he was physically worn out. I believe the Senator from Utah has suffered physical incapacity upon occasion. He knows how difficult it is to be present always.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois was incapacitated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the attendance record of the Senator from Illinois was about 93 percent, as shown by the rollcalls.

Mr. WATKINS. I was not aware of the disability of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not blazon my illness publicly, nor make any appeal for sympathy because of it; but since the Senator from Utah implied that I ran away from a fight, I think perhaps he is entitled to know the truth.

Mr. WATKINS. I am only taking the record as it stands. It indicated that the Senator did not vote.

ANNUAL FLOW OF COLORADO RELATIVELY SMALL

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe certain fundamental facts about the Colorado River project need to be noted. The first is that in spite of all the talk of the flow of water in the Colorado River, in relative terms, it is limited. I know that the lower valley is pledged 7½ million acre-feet, that the upper valley is pledged 7½ million acre-feet, and that by a subsequent treaty entered into with Mexico, that country is given a million and a half acre-feet. Therefore we have pledged 16½ million acre-feet of the Colorado. I know, however, that over a 40-year period the average flow in the Colorado at Lee Ferry is a little more than 15 million acre-feet. Am I in error?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator is in error. I believe the water allotted to Mexico must come from the water of the various States in case there is not a surplus of water in the river.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then over a period of 40 years there has been enough water to fulfill the claims of 15 million acre-feet. Of course, for the past 10 years, largely because of low rainfall, the average flow for a 10-year period has been 13.6 million acre-feet. Therefore, at the present time there is a deficiency in the flow of the Colorado River water below that which has been pledged.

However, that is not the precise point I wish to make. The flow of the Colorado is relatively small in comparison with other great rivers of the United States. Let us take, for example, the flow of the Columbia River. The flow of the Columbia River at The Dalles is 141 million acre-feet a year. That is more than 10 times the average flow of the Colorado River. The flow of the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, upon which some of us want to erect that great dam at Hells Canyon, is 32.2 million acre-feet a year, or more than twice the flow of the Colorado.

The basin figure for the flow of the Tennessee is 48 million acre-feet a year, or more than 3½ times the flow of the Colorado. The Niagara—and we do not hear many people talk about the

Niagara—has a flow of 140 million acre-feet a year.

If we want to develop power, Mr. President, the place to develop it is on the Columbia, the Snake, or the Niagara, not on the Colorado.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to ask the Senator, if a citizen of Utah wanted to develop waterpower, would he be able to develop it on the Columbia, the Tennessee, or the Niagara?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber when I said that I understood and appreciated and did not attack the motives of the Senators from the four States concerned. Those Senators are not only Senators of the United States, but they are also, in a sense, ambassadors from their respective States. I can quite understand that they should wish to defend the interests of their States. I do not attack them for their advocacy of this bill. It is understandable. For them to do otherwise would be political suicide. It is not unethical for those Senators to do what they are doing. Quite to the contrary, I should say.

However, I feel it is time that we consider this issue from the standpoint of the national interest; namely, whether it is best for the welfare of the country as a whole, and whether this is the best place to put the people's money.

So far as power is concerned—and I shall come to irrigation later—the place to develop power now is on the Columbia, Snake, and Niagara Rivers, not on the Colorado River.

I have already pointed out that, so far as putting water on the land is concerned, if Professor Sears is correct—and I believe he is—more crops can be raised by putting water on already fertile land, such as in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, upper New York, western Massachusetts, and the lower Mississippi Valley, than on semiarid, high altitude land.

Professor Sears wrote an article on the subject, which was published in the *Annals of the American Academy*. In it he gives the acreage costs. According to Professor Sears, the acreage costs in those areas are one-tenth or one-twentieth of what they are in the area under discussion, and his figures do not take into account interest.

Mr. President, let us take up the various purposes for which this money is to be spent. I take it there are three purposes, namely, power, irrigation, and water supply.

I do not believe anyone takes very seriously the "red herring" which the senior Senator from Utah has injected, that of flood control. There is not much of a flood control problem on the Colorado River.

EXCESSIVE COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION PER KILOWATT OF CAPACITY

Let us start with power. Power developed on the Colorado is extremely high-cost power. It is upon this high-cost power that the advocates of the project depend for meeting 85 percent of the

irrigation costs of the upper Colorado River Basin. I believe that is a correct statement, Mr. President?

Glen Canyon is to have a construction cost of \$421 million, and \$370 million allocated to power. It is to generate 800,000 kilowatts of power. There will be \$463 of construction cost per kilowatt capacity.

Echo Park is to have spent on it \$128 million allocated to power. It is to generate a capacity of 200,000 kilowatts. That will be generated at a cost of \$640 per kilowatt.

The figures for the Central Utah project show a construction cost of \$765 per kilowatt. At Cross Mountain, the construction cost per kilowatt will be \$605. At Curecanti, the cost will be in excess of \$1,030. At Flaming Gorge, the cost will be \$722 per kilowatt capacity. The average cost will be \$500 per kilowatt capacity.

What have been some of the construction costs at other major dams? The cost at Bonneville was \$115 per kilowatt. At Fort Peck, it was \$156 per kilowatt capacity. At Dennis Dam, on the Red River, it was \$279. At Norfolk, Ark., \$184. At Marrows, Ark., \$290. At Bull Shoals, Ark., \$314. Fort Gilson, Okla., \$519. Tenkiller, Okla., \$416. Whitney, Tex., \$407. Hoover Dam, \$112. Grand Coulee, \$90. Shasta, Calif., \$130. Parker Dam, on the lower Colorado, \$134. Davis Dam, near Parker Dam, \$278. The construction cost of the 18 dams on the TVA was \$166 per kilowatt capacity.

Therefore, the cost of construction per kilowatt capacity is about 3 times as high as it is in the Tennessee Valley, over 4 times as high as it is at Bonneville, almost 5 times more than at Hoover, and almost 6 times what it is at Grand Coulee.

In other words, Mr. President, we are being asked to spend \$856 million on power in about the worst place in the United States where hydroelectric power could be developed.

EXCESSIVE GENERATING COSTS PER KILOWATT-HOUR

What will this mean in terms of costs per kilowatt-hour?

I shall discuss only generating costs. Gen. U. S. Grant, the grandson of the great General and President of the United States, testified before the committee that the generating costs at Glen Canyon, which is the lowest of the dams just before Lee's Ferry, will be from 4.2 to 4.7 mills a kilowatt-hour.

At Echo Park, the costs will be from 5.9 to 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Upstream from Echo Park, the costs will be greater, and it is provided, as everyone who has studied the report knows, that the power is to be sold at 6 mills a kilowatt hour.

Let us see what these costs are in comparison with Columbia River costs and TVA costs.

The generating cost at Bonneville, in the year 1954, was a little over six-tenths of a mill. If we include all indirect charges, it would not exceed 1 mill.

The cost at Grand Coulee was less than half a mill a kilowatt hour, and if we included all indirect charges, such as interest and depreciation, the total cost per kilowatt-hour was less than a mill.

At Hells Canyon the best estimates range somewhere between 2.5 and 2.6 mills.

I may say that the great advantage of a high dam at Hells Canyon is not so much lower costs of generation at the spot but the fact that a great deal of water will be stored which can then be released to the dams downstreams, reducing the costs at those points still further.

In other words, the costs of the Columbia River are from one-sixth to one-fifth as much as the costs on the Upper Colorado River, where they are from 5 to 6 times the costs on the main stem of the Columbia, and over twice as much as at Hells Canyon.

What about TVA, Mr. President? I hold in my hand the Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the year 1954. There we find the production costs for the multiple-use dams and the single-use dams on page A25. These include not only operating costs, but interest and depreciation charges. What do we find?

The cost at Kentucky Dam was 0.487 of a mill less than half a mill.

Pickwick Dam, 0.900 of a mill.

Wilson Dam, 0.669, or approximately two-thirds of a mill.

Wheeler Dam, 0.795, or about four-fifths of a mill.

Guntersville, 0.723, or about seven-tenths of a mill.

Hales Bar, 1.227, or about one and one-fifth mills.

Chickamauga, 0.739, or approximately three-fourths of a mill.

Watts Bar, 0.726, or a little over seven-tenths of a mill.

Fort Loudoun, 1.009 mills.

Norris, the first dam of the Tennessee system, 0.894 of a mill.

Hiwassee, 0.617 of a mill.

Cherokee, 2.073 mills.

Fontana, 0.588 of a mill.

South Holston, 1.552.

Watauga, 3.048 mills.

Douglas, 1.505 mills.

Boone, 2.371 mills.

There is a grand average for the total of multiple-use dams of 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour contrasted with the 4.2 to 4.7 mills at Glen Canyon or the 6 mills at Echo Park, or the more than 6 mills on the power dams high up on the Colorado or on tributary streams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator give me some indication of how long he will speak.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to speak for approximately an hour, but I had so many interesting interruptions from the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Utah that I am just getting warmed up in my argument.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator be agreeable to the Senate's taking a recess at approximately 6 o'clock—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; with the understanding that I may have the floor tomorrow after the morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is what I intended to propose to the Sen-

ator if I could have concluded my sentence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought that was what the Senator intended, but I wanted to stake out my ground so I would not forget it later and so the Senator from Texas would not forget it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may yield the floor at this time with the understanding that tomorrow, following the morning hour, he will be recognized and will have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend substantially to object—I should like to finish the argument on power costs so that the record on that point may be complete.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so. I then wish to be recognized, Mr. President, and shall then yield to Members who wish to introduce bills or make brief statements.

Has the unanimous-consent request been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I have indicated, the costs per kilowatt-hour in the case of the projects contemplated by the pending bill, are four times the average costs of the multiple dams on the Tennessee River, and the cost at Echo Park is six times the average cost on the Tennessee River. The cost of the farther-upstream dams is over six times the cost on the Tennessee River.

Mr. President, what about the single-use dams on the Tennessee River, where nothing is charged off for navigation or flood control?

The average cost of these 10 single-use dams is 1.575 mills per kilowatt-hour, or about one-third the cost at Glen Canyon, only a little over one-fourth of the cost at Echo Park, and probably less than one-fourth with reference to the other dams upstream.

Mr. President, if we wish to generate the power in this region, is the Colorado River the best means of generating it? There are large deposits of coal, shale, and oil in Colorado and Wyoming. These are all potential sources of fuel. I wish to point out that on the upper Colorado River power can be generated more cheaply from coal, in all probability, than it can by the use of water-power.

We have more material on this subject from the reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have a number of steam plants, 9 steam plants plus 3 small plants. Their average cost of generation is 2.988 mills per kilowatt-hour, or just under 3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The waterpower cost is about one-third of this, and about one-half of the amount in connection with the single-use dams.

So hydroelectric power is economical in the valley of the Tennessee. Similarly, it is economical in the valley of the Columbia, because there are no alternative sources of power or heat in the Columbia, unless atomic energy should later be used.

But the point I wish to make is that the upper Colorado region has coal. We know that the region back of Pueblo, in Colorado, has coal. We know of the coal mines and coal resources of Wyoming.

If it costs 3 mills to generate power by steam, which comes ultimately from coal, in the valley of the Tennessee, will it cost much more than that to generate power from coal in the upper Colorado? Possibly it will cost a little more. There may be differences in the quality of coal and in the costs of transportation. But by locating the powerplants close to the mine mouths transportation costs could be reduced, and lower cost power could be obtained from coal in the upper Colorado area—I venture to predict—than could be obtained by using the waters of the Colorado River.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTING PUBLIC POWER AT WORST SITES

It is extraordinary that this administration, which has frowned upon additional dams on the Columbia, which has turned down a high dam at Hells Canyon, and which certainly has frowned upon power projects in the Niagara, should choose the upper Colorado as the place where it intends to launch a public power program. It has chosen the worst possible place for its public power program, while it is giving away the best locations such as on the Snake to private industry. If it were the intention of the administration to discredit public power, and I wish to make this statement carefully, it could not have proceeded in a more effective fashion than by giving to the private companies the rich pickings, while pushing the public projects away up in the mountains where there are inadequate water flows, inadequate power facilities, and high costs; where the experiment will be discredited and will be regarded thereafter as an indication of a failure of public power.

Mr. President, though I come from Illinois, where the rivers flow gently and there are not great possibilities for hydroelectric development, I have voted for public power projects on the Tennessee and on the Columbia. I was very proud to place my name on the Hells Canyon bill, because I think that will be a justifiable project, which will pay out, even though the direct benefit to my section of the country will not be great.

I say this to indicate that I try to take a national point of view on these issues. However, I object to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on projects which, in all probability, cannot pay out; which involve a waste of public funds; and which will discredit the system of public power.

So I urge that we look to see whether we "are paying too much for the whistle."

There are many persons who favor irrigation and will support any irrigation project, lest it be thought that they are enemies of irrigation. There are many persons who favor public power and therefore feel compelled to vote for every public power project, no matter whether or not it is justifiable.

If I may use the analogy, I think we should look each of these projects in the

mouth, to see whether they are justifiable. If they are justifiable, we should proceed with them. If they are not justifiable, we should not go ahead with them.

The projects on the Columbia and the Tennessee are sound and of great public benefit. The Hells Canyon project would be sound and of great public benefit. Additional dams for the generation of power on the Columbia and the Niagara would be of great benefit. But, for heaven's sake, let us not start the project on the upper Colorado. To do so would be a waste of money, because it would produce high-cost power which, in all probability, would be driven out by steam plants, and might result in not even the paying back of the capital cost, let alone the interest.

Yet it is upon the believed surplus earnings of the Glen Canyon project that all the rest of the program is based, because 85 percent of the capital cost of the irrigation projects is to be met by charges for power. The rate is to be 6 mills. That is a high rate. The only dam which can possibly produce power at less than 6 mills is Glen Canyon. It is possible that a dam at Glen Canyon might be justifiable. But certainly the project as a whole would be a wasteful, high cost project, which should not be carried out.

Mr. President, I shall now yield the floor. When I resume tomorrow, in addition to summarizing the ground I have covered, I shall discuss the question of irrigation costs, water reserves, and recreation.

FOREIGN TRADE—PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION VERSUS 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, all that the American workingmen and investors of this Nation have ever asked for is an even break in their own American markets.

FLEXIBLE DUTY TO EQUALIZE EFFECTIVE WAGES

They have demanded a flexible duty or tariff to equalize the effective wages and taxes here and in the chief competing country on each product.

DUTY REDUCED AS FOREIGN LIVING STANDARD RAISED

Such a duty would be reduced as the foreign wage standard of living increased and when the cost of production approached our own, then free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The principle of fair and reasonable competition was the answer of Congress to the low-wage foreign competition for almost a century of time. It established the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

The principle established equal access to the American market for the American workingmen and investors.

DUTY TAKES PROFIT OUT OF SWEATSHOP LABOR

Such a flexible duty, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competi-

tion, simply takes the profit out of foreign sweatshop labor. It does not prevent imports, but brings them in on our wage standard of living basis.

AMENDMENTS TO SAVE INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES

The desperate effort of investors' and workingmen's groups to save their own particular industry or product from annihilation by amending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is proof enough of the damage the act has done and that it offers for the future.

I introduce a bill proposing to amend the 1930 Tariff Act. The amendment provides the flexibility needed, after 22 years, to establish foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and to provide equal access to his own American markets for the American workingmen and investors.

MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

It is well known that the low-wage foreign nations manipulate their price, their currency in terms of the dollar and subsidize their own exports through grants, multiple rates of exchange and by other methods to defeat any regulation of imports into this country, and to prevent American imports into their own nation.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION COST

The amendment provides that the Tariff Commission may take cognizance of such manipulation in the adjustment of duties or tariffs, and may take into consideration the landed duty paid price, and the offered for sale price in the determination of the cost of production of an imported article.

QUANTITATIVE LIMITS

The amendment also provides that the Commission may impose quantitative limits—quotas—on the importation of any article in its determination of the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

THE AMENDMENT TO 1930 TARIFF ACT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, my bill—amending the 1930 Tariff Act—regulating foreign trade on the principle of fair and reasonable competition, giving to the American workingmen and investors equal access to their own American markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1723) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports.

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to main-

tain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1955, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"Sec. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may

continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however, That* no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided, That* any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however, That* no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 20, 1955
For actions of April 19, 1955
84th-1st, No. 64

CONTENTS

Achievement award.....27	Foreign aid.....1,19	Property.....12,34
Acreage allotments.....8	Foreign trade.....18	Reclamation.....2,7,22
Administrative expenses.....28	Forestry.....1,12	Roads.....1,31
Appropriations.....1,4,28	Holiday.....35	School lunch.....1
Buildings and grounds.....12	Labor.....25	States' rights.....34
Cotton.....20	Lands.....12	Sugar.....17
Dairy industry.....10,13,16	Livestock and meats.....16,32	Tariffs.....18
Disaster relief.....8,33	Loans, farm.....8	Taxation.....32
Disease and pest control.....1	Marketing.....26	Technical assistance.....1
Education.....34	Natural resources.....10,24	Trade agreements.....9
Electrification, rural10,23	Penalty mail.....6	Transportation.....32,34
Family farms.....10	Personnel1,3,11,20,27,30	Treaties.....34
Farm program.....10,21	Postal service.....6,15	Water utilization.....5
Farm relief.....8	Price supports.....14	Wheat referendum.....29
Food, surplus.....17		Wind erosion control.....1

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Senate debated Colorado reclamation project. House subcommittee voted for bill to authorize loans to non-Federal reclamation projects. Senate committee voted on various provisions of trade agreements bill. Sens. Russell, Stennis, and Johnston criticized USDA's adverse attitude on bill to provide additional acreage allotments in freeze areas. Rep. Betts introduced and discussed bill to eliminate 15-acre requirement for wheat-referendum vote.

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 4903 (H. Rept. 426) (pp. 3985-6). The conferees agreed to \$650,000 for disease and pest control (House, \$500,000; Senate, \$700,000); eliminated the \$7,000,000 Senate item for the school lunch program; reported in disagreement the Senate amendment to reimburse the President's disaster fund for wind erosion control under ACP; agreed to transfer of \$6,500,000 for the UN technical assistance program (House, \$4,000,000; Senate, \$8,000,000); agreed to \$3,500,000 for forest highways (House, \$3,000,000; Senate, \$4,000,000); and agreed to \$7,500,000 for unemployment compensation for Federal employees (Senate, \$13,000,000).

The bill also provides \$2,570,000 for forest-pest control and makes ARS and FS appropriations available for uniform allowances.

2. RECLAMATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full Committee H. R. 104, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and non-Federal participation in Federal projects (p. D306).

Rep. Hosmer spoke in favor of using more of the West's water for industrialization and less emphasis on reclamation for agricultural purposes (pp. 4012-15).

April 19, 1955

-2-

3. PERSONNEL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 4644, the postal-pay bill (pp. 4000-1).
4. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 4876 (p. 3981). Senate conferees have been appointed.
5. RIVER DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Trimble criticized Budget Circular A-47, relating to allocation of costs of river projects under the Corps of Engineers (pp. 4020-2).
6. PENALTY MAIL. Both Houses received from the Post Office Department a proposed bill to repeal the requirement for departments to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; to Committees on Post Office and Civil Service (pp. 4025, 3898-9).

SENATE

7. RECLAMATION. Continued debate on S. 500, to authorize the Colorado reclamation project (pp. 3911-80). Sen. Bennett inserted a letter from Secretary Benson on the need for additional agricultural land (p. 3973).
8. FARM RELIEF; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; FARM LOANS. Sens. Russell, Stennis, and Johnston criticized the Department for recommending against S. 1628, which would provide additional acreage allotments to farmers whose crops are damaged by the weather, etc., including the recent freeze; stated that the Department should have recommended an alternative solution to the problem; and objected to the increase to 5% in the interest rate on certain farm loans (pp. 3909-11).
9. TRADE AGREEMENTS. The Finance Committee voted on various provisions of H. R. 1, the trade agreements bill, including a provision to continue the program until June 30, 1958 (pp. D303-4).
10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Farmers Union Central Exchange (St. Paul) resolution regarding the dairy program, family farm policy, farm program, rural electrification, natural resources, etc. (pp. 3901-2).
11. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report S. 1094, to remove the appropriation limitation on Federal employees' uniform allowances (p. D304).
12. FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY. The Legislative Reporting Staff has obtained a supply of S. Doc. 32 (Apr. 13, 1955), "Inventory Report on Federal Real Property in the U. S. as of December 31, 1953, Prepared by General Services Administration at the Request of the Committee on Appropriations of the U. S. Senate."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Johnson, Wisc., inserted 3 Collier's magazine articles, "Milk 12 Cents a Quart," discussing problems facing dairy farmers and consumers on the selling and consumption of milk; and stated that he hoped that the House Agriculture Dairy Subcommittee "will soon have some authoritative information on these problems..." (pp. A2571-4).

much acreage would be required of any crop to assure a livelihood for the operator and his family, taking into consideration other crops on the farm and the size and economic status of the farm family, would involve the exercise of judgment decisions by our more than 3,000 farmer committees, which neither they nor we could discharge with a fair degree of accuracy or equity as between farmers.

2. The bill would be expensive to administer. As you are aware, our present budget includes \$39 million a year to administer acreage allotment and marketing quota programs. The additional work in making necessary adjustments entailed in carrying out the bill would add greatly to the present expense. The exact amount would be difficult to determine in the absence of experience. In addition to the administrative expense, additional program expense would be involved in supporting the price of the commodities grown on the additional acreage allotted over and above that presently authorized or required.

3. The bill would set a dangerous precedent by using acreage allotment programs for insurance or relief purposes which they are not designed to serve. The bill is completely contrary to recent legislation authorizing additional reductions in Burley tobacco acreage allotments to adjust supplies in line with demand. The additional allotments called for by this bill can only serve to further aggravate existing disparities between supplies and market outlets for crops under control. Producers of basic commodities who are making very steep reductions in their acreage in an effort to bring about better balance in production should not be required to shoulder the burden of providing disaster insurance. Disasters are a matter of concern to everyone, and we believe that any relief granted should be through recovery measures in which the general public participates.

Under existing law the Department has authorized the making of emergency loans to eligible farmers who have suffered substantial losses as a result of the recent freeze and are not able to obtain from other established sources the credit needed to continue their normal operations, including the maintenance and care of orchards. Although it is expected that these loans will be repaid as rapidly as possible, consideration is given to the circumstances of the farmers in each area in the determination of terms and security policies relating to the making of these loans.

If the Congress feels that something more than the disaster loans or drought-relief programs presently provided by legislation is needed, such relief should be provided outside the acreage allotment and marketing quota program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is entitled to the floor.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the session yesterday I was attempting to describe the main features of the Upper Colorado project and to give the reasons why I thought it was not in the public interest that the pending bill be passed.

I pointed out that the bill authorizes the expenditure, within the not too distant future, of \$1,658,000,000, and that, of this authorization, \$656 million was to be allocated to power, \$915 million to irrigation, and a little more than \$72 million to the supply of municipal water.

I also pointed out that, in all probability, this was a gross underestimate of what the actual costs would be, because in the past the final costs have been more than double the costs originally estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation. So, in all probability, we face an ultimate capital expenditure of at least \$2 billion, and possibly very much more than that sum.

Moreover, no interest is to be paid on the amounts allocated to reclamation, in the minimum figure of \$915 million. In the case of power projects, as we know, not only is the principal repaid, but interest is paid. In the case of irrigation, only the principal is repaid, but not the interest.

Since there is to be a 10-year developmental period, during which no interest is to be paid, and no return on the capital is to be paid, and a subsequent 50-year period during which the capital is supposed to be repaid, this means that for 60 years the public will either pay interest on bonds which are floated, or will forego the interest which might otherwise be collected. A rough computation, based on figures submitted by the Department of the Interior, indicates that the interest costs will be, at a minimum, in excess of \$1,100,000,000. Therefore, the irrigation costs now run to approximately \$2 billion, at a minimum, and the power costs are set at \$656 million. In view of the fact that the Bureau chronically underestimates the final costs, we may be dealing with total costs vastly in excess of \$3 billion.

In my opinion, the huge size of these sums requires much more careful consideration than the Senate and Congress have in the past given to this proposal.

POWER COSTS ARE EXTREMELY HIGH

Toward the end of the session yesterday I turned to the question of power, and pointed out that this would be extremely high-cost power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the Columbia River. It is only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River. It is less than half the flow of the Snake River, in connection with which there has been considerable debate as to whether a high dam should be erected at Hells Canyon.

As a result of all this, the costs of installing generating capacity are extremely high.

EXCESSIVE CONSTRUCTION COSTS PER KILOWATT INSTALLED

I pointed out that at Glen Canyon, the cost of construction per kilowatt capacity was \$463; at Echo Park, \$640; at Central Utah, \$765; at Cross Mountain, \$605; at Curecanti, more than \$1,000; and at Flaming Gorge, more than \$700. The average cost for the power feature of the project as a whole is somewhat in excess of \$500 per kilowatt of capacity.

Let us compare that cost with the average cost in the Tennessee Valley of \$166 per kilowatt of capacity. That is the figure for the 18 dams on the Tennessee River. In other words, the average cost of building the dams and installing the generators and the equipment necessary to generate power would be 3 times as great in the projects contemplated on the Colorado than in the 18 projects already completed on the Tennessee.

Furthermore, at Bonneville, the average cost was only \$115. Therefore, the relative construction cost on the Colorado is between 4 and 5 times the cost at Bonneville. At Hoover, the cost was only \$112. Again we have a figure for the Colorado which is between 4 and 5 times as high. At Grand Coulee, the cost was only \$90. As a result, we have a cost on the Colorado more than 5 times and possibly somewhere around 6 times what the cost was at the great dam at Grand Coulee.

In other words, we are being asked to spend \$656 million for power in about the worst place in the United States where hydroelectric power could be developed. This fact shows up in the figures on the generating cost per kilowatt-hour.

EXCESSIVE GENERATING COSTS

I cited the testimony of Gen. U. S. Grant, III, to the effect that the generating costs at Glen Canyon—the dam just above Lee's Ferry—which is the prize project, would be between 4.2 and 4.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is the best of all the dams.

I cited the fact that at Echo Park—the much discussed Echo Park—power would sell for 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and the costs are probably not far from that figure. At the dams higher up the river from Echo Park the cost would be in excess of 6 mills.

How do those costs compare with the costs in other great hydroelectric projects in the country? I pointed out that at Bonneville the generating cost per kilowatt-hour was a little more than 6 tenths of a mill, but if depreciation and interest were included, as they should be, the costs are about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

At Grand Coulee the power generating costs are less than a half mill per kilowatt-hour, and would still be less than 1 mill even if interest and depreciation were taken into account, as I believe they should be.

At Hells Canyon the estimated costs, with all items taken into consideration, would be approximately 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour.

On the TVA for 17 multiple-use dams, all costs, including depreciation and interest, amount to only 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour; and on the 10 single-use dams, where nothing is written off, either for navigation or for flood control, the costs are less than 1.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In other words, Mr. President, we are being asked to authorize projects where the generating costs will be from 4½ to more than 6 times the costs on the Columbia River; from 2 to 2½ times the costs at Hells Canyon; from 4½ to 6 times the costs of the multiple dams on the Tennessee River; and from 3 to 4 times the costs of the single-use dams. So, we are being asked to plunge hundreds of millions of dollars, and, indirectly, some billions of dollars, into the most unfavorable location in the United States.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION IS
INCONSISTENT

I pointed out that it was extraordinary that an administration which has declared public power to be creeping socialism, which has put the lid down on additional dams on the Columbia River, which has opposed Hells Canyon, and which has certainly turned a cold shoulder to the power development of the Niagara River, should go up into the mountains of Colorado and there locate public power projects where the costs will be 3, 4, or 5 times what they would be at these other locations.

Mr. President, I am not saying that the administration wishes to have this project fail. I wish to be very careful in what I say. But I will say that if the administration had wished to discredit the public power system it could not have proceeded in any better fashion than it has done in this instance, because it is turning over the favorable locations to private industry and concentrating enormous expenditures in high-cost areas where, in my judgment, the losses will be extremely heavy. Is it possible that this industry believes in the socialization of losses.

The power thus generated is to be sold at 6 mills per kilowatt. That will be about the cost at Echo Park, probably will be slightly less than the cost at the dams to the north of Echo Park. Therefore, the Glen Canyon Dam is expected to carry the whole burden of the program, to bring in virtually the only profit which will accrue, and then, in addition, to carry 85 percent of the enormous capital expenditures for irrigation. In other words, Mr. President, upon a very slender foundation of earning power there is being erected a tremendous superstructure of expenditure. If construction costs at Glen Canyon go up, if it turns out that instead of the \$370 million allocated to power at Glen Canyon, the actual costs amount to \$500 million, and if the Bureau of Reclamation runs true to form, and grossly underestimates the ultimate cost, as it commonly does, we shall find Glen Canyon

costs approaching close to 6 mills per kilowatt-hour; so there will be no profit.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. WATKINS. I had no intention of making a speech at this point.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the figures of costs of power at these various projects the matter of retirement of capital is also included?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator also aware of the fact that the costs include transmission lines as well?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think they include transmission lines. I think these are costs at the bus bar. The 6-mill figure is the price at the bus bar.

Mr. WATKINS. At the load center.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the site or close to the site of the dams themselves. It is not a delivered price.

Mr. WATKINS. It is the price at the load centers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not the price in Denver, Salt Lake, or Albuquerque. It is the price at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, and the other power points.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand there is a difference between the price at the bus bar and the price at the load center.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to show is that it is not a delivered price. It is the price at which the "juice" is fed from the generating turbines into the system.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand it is the price at the load centers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the Senator mean by "load centers"? Does he mean it is the delivered price for Denver?

Mr. WATKINS. It would probably be the price at the load center at Denver. I shall try to discuss that particular matter. I think the Senator from Illinois has been given figures which do not correspond to ours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is a delivered price, then the costs of the transmission lines must be figured in addition, and the margin of profit would be still less. If the generating costs at Glen Canyon are 4.5 mills, if the price of electricity delivered in Denver is 6 mills, and depreciation and maintenance costs of the transmission lines have to come out of that, then it is even less profitable than I thought it was. I was trying to give the Senator the benefit of every doubt. He has now convinced me that the project, even at Glen Canyon, about which I had some doubts, is totally unjustifiable.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not see how the Senator can take the line of reasoning that the cost would be 6 mills at the point of use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The price is 6 mills. The cost at Glen Canyon is from 4.2 to 4.7 mills, according to General Grant. If the price is 6 mills in Denver and this includes transmission costs, then, obviously, the margin between the two is less than has been assumed, the profit will be less, and the ability to support the huge irrigation system which the Senator from Utah is advocating will be still less.

Mr. WATKINS. The fact of the matter is that the actual cost of producing the power at Glen Canyon and at Echo Park is approximately 2 mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have always thought General Grant was an extremely competent engineer and an extremely fine citizen. He was for many years a member of the United States Corps of Engineers. I think at one time he may have been the commanding officer of that corps. He is a grandson of the great Civil War general and post-Civil War President. His testimony will be found in the hearings at page 385. It is to the effect that the costs—

Mr. WATKINS. I simply wanted the Senator to have in mind, in connection with this discussion, that I intend to discuss the subject later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. But the Senator has raised this question. Let me now read the testimony of General Grant, which appears at page 385 of the hearings:

The Glen Canyon Dam is all important in the program because it is the one and only one at which electric power can be produced at a cost, estimated by the Bureau at 4.7 mills and by the Federal Power Commission at 4.2 mills, or less, that will insure a substantial profit when sold at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

If the Federal Power Commission's estimate of cost is correct, the differential in cost between the cost of Glen Canyon and Echo Park power will be five or more times the profit possible on Echo Park power at the lowest estimate of its cost.

I only wish such figures as the Senator now brings out had been included in the report which was submitted to the Senate on yesterday.

I take it that the Senator from Utah has no further observations on this point.

STEAM POWER WOULD BE LESS EXPENSIVE

If the upper Colorado were the only source of power for this region, perhaps we might say, "Well, let us go ahead with the power features, at least." But there are alternative sources of power. There are coal deposits in both Wyoming and Colorado. We hear much about the shale deposits of Wyoming. There is also oil in Wyoming.

The TVA experience has shown that power can be generated from steam, and therefore ultimately from coal, at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour, with all costs included, or appreciably less than the cost at Glen Canyon, and very much less than the cost at Echo Park.

So what is likely to be found, if the project should be undertaken and completed, is that the power, to the degree that it is needed, will not be supplied by the hydroelectric projects, but that private industry will be coming in, installing powerplants near the mouths of the mines, transmitting power, underselling the Government power, putting the Government out of business, and wrecking the whole public project. This can quite likely happen.

So while the Tennessee River was admirably adapted to hydroelectric development because of heavy rainfall in the Appalachian Mountains and I think could have been developed only by a public corporation; and while the Co-

lumbia and the Snake have a tremendous flow of water for the same reason, and while the Niagara River is admirably adapted to the development of electric power—and the scale of investment on the Columbia would have been impossible under private ownership—the upper Colorado is one of the worst places in the country in which to develop hydroelectric power.

PUBLIC POWER PROJECTS SHOULD BE JUDGED ON THEIR MERITS

I am distressed, because I find that the doctrinaires on the public power side and the irrigation side are falling in with the upper Colorado project simply because it is called public power and irrigation. I have talked with a number of Senators who have voted with me in the past to support Tennessee Valley Authority and Columbia River appropriations and who, with me, favor the public development of Hells Canyon. I am distressed to find now that they favor this project because it means public power.

Each of these projects should be judged on its own merits, without regard to doctrinaire considerations. If it is the purpose of Senators to discredit public power, then let them vote for this project, because I do not believe it will pay out. It will result in high-cost power.

But if it is desired to develop worthwhile facilities, then let the money be spent at Hells Canyon or on the Niagara or on some of the other dams of the Columbia. In fact, I think power could be transmitted down into this area through the interconnected power lines of both private and public power companies from the upper portion of the Columbia River Basin far more cheaply than it could be generated on the Colorado River itself. So I submit that the power feature of the program is unjustifiable and should not be carried out.

THOSE CHARGING CREEPING SOCIALISM AT TVA SUPPORT THE COLORADO PROJECT

Ironically, it is very interesting to note that a number of Senators who have opposed public power in the Tennessee Valley and in the Columbia River Valley, now suddenly emerge as great champions of public power when it is proposed to be placed in these areas of the mountains of Colorado. This is an extraordinary, "deep sea" change. These Senators, our good colleagues, at various times have denounced the TVA and the Columbia projects, but now they emerge as champions of the public development of the upper Colorado.

Was it Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who once said that "abstract considerations have no effect on concrete decisions"?

IRRIGATION COSTS EXCESSIVE

What about the irrigation costs of the project? It should be remembered that \$915 million admittedly will be spent upon irrigation, and in all probability additional hundreds of millions will be spent in the future.

It should be remembered that while the principal is to be repaid, 85 percent of it is to be repaid from the hoped-for profits over and above the cost of the power features of the program. In reality it will be paid from Glen Canyon,

because that is the only possible feature of the program which can earn any net surplus—and, to my mind, it is very doubtful whether any net surplus will be earned at Glen Canyon.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that during the long life of the reclamation law, there has been a steady lengthening of the period during which no interest is paid.

When under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, an eminent predecessor of our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who now occupies the chair, the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed—and it was one of the great acts in the history of this country—it contained a provision that interest was to be forgiven for a 10-year period, in order to start the projects and get them under way.

As I pointed out yesterday, in colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the original projects tended to be at low altitudes and in fertile soil, and to involve low costs. The first project was in the Salt River region of Arizona, in the Phoenix area where Roosevelt Dam was erected, the last of the great masonry dams, before concrete came into use. I have gone over Roosevelt Dam and have inspected it rather carefully. That project and other irrigation projects were successful.

But gradually, as the accessible sites were exhausted, and the hunger for reclamation continued, the influence of the arid and semiarid States in Congress, particularly in the Senate, was great.

As Senators probably have observed, an interesting tendency exists for Senators from those States to congregate on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations, which consider irrigation and reclamation bills. There is a sort of affinity. Just as sugar draws flies, so those committees draw members from the States which can benefit from the authorizations and appropriations which are made for such projects.

REPAYMENT PERIOD WITHOUT INTEREST EXTENDED

In 1914 the repayment period of 10 years was extended to 20 years. In 1924 it was made a 5-year developmental period plus 20 years for repayment. During the developmental period no payments upon the principal were to be made. So for 25 years there was to be no interest paid.

In 1926 this arrangement was changed to a 40-year repayment period during which no interest was to be paid. In 1939 the time was extended still further, to a preliminary period of 10 years during which no payment on capital or interest was to be paid, and then to a period of 40 years of gradual repayment but without interest. At no time in the 50 years was any interest to be paid.

Now Congress is being asked to authorize the projects provided for by the pending bill upon the basis of a 10-year developmental period, with no payments on the principal, and a 50-year period of retirement of principal at straight-line rates, presumably, or a total of 60

years during which no interest is to be paid.

The result is that the interest component in the cost, though hidden, has been constantly increasing. It was only slight 50 years ago; but now it amounts to appreciably more than the principal itself. According to the Department of the Interior, which is advocating this project, the ratio is about 1.25 to 1. That is, the interest cost will be about 25 percent greater than the cost of the construction itself.

So, Mr. President, the actual costs of the irrigation projects, and I am one who believes that interest is a cost, will be in excess of \$2 billion, at a minimum, and may, to the degree that costs are underestimated, run to \$3 billion.

IRRIGATION COSTS PER ACRE EXCESSIVE

Now we can figure out what the costs an acre will be. I have been making some computations to that effect. A total of 132,360 acres of new land, so called, will be irrigated in the first 12 projects, and 250,000 acres of land will receive what is known as supplemental water. A very interesting question is how one can equate the land which receives supplemental water with the land on which water is furnished for the first time, and which apparently will be the almost exclusive recipient of the water.

We have canvassed that situation, and the facts seem to be as follows: It is contemplated that on the so-called new land, water will be furnished to a depth of 18 inches a year, or 1½ acre-feet a year for each acre. On the supplemental land, so-called, it is understood that the average amount of water furnished a year will be approximately to a depth of 6 inches per acre or one-half acre-foot a year.

Therefore, for irrigation purposes 3 acres of supplemental land can be taken as the equivalent of 1 acre of new land. This produces a figure of 216,000 acres of "equivalent new land."

We have the irrigation figures of cost for these various projects, and I shall read them, first excluding interest costs, dividing the total cost allocated to irrigation by the number of acres of "equivalent new land."

In the LaBarge project, in Wyoming, \$210 an acre.

In the Seedskaadee project, in Wyoming, \$383 an acre.

In the Lyman project, in Wyoming, \$780 an acre.

In the Silt project, in Colorado, \$878 an acre.

In the Smith Fork project, in Colorado, \$670 an acre.

In the Paonia project, in Colorado, \$949 an acre.

In the Florida project, in Colorado, \$618 an acre.

In the Pine River project extension, in Colorado-New Mexico, \$332 an acre.

In the Emery County project, in Utah, \$922 an acre.

I would appreciate it if my good friend the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would give me his very close attention now.

In the Central Utah project, \$1,757 an acre—more than \$1,700 an acre on an equivalent acre basis.

On the Hammond project, in New Mexico, \$627 an acre.

On the Gooseberry project, in Utah, \$1,047 an acre.

There is a general average of \$952 an acre for the 12 projects taken as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that a table showing the cost per acre for irrigated land in the 12 authorized participating projects on the Colorado River storage project be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project (1)	New land irrigated (acres) (2)	Supplemental land (acres)		Total acres irrigated (2 plus 3) (5)	Total acres irrigated equivalent new land (2 plus 4) (6)	Construction costs allocated to irrigation (report, p. 187) (7)	Average project cost per acre (report, p. 187) (8)	Cost per acre on equivalent new land acre basis (9)
		Actual (3)	New land equivalent (4)					
1. LaBarge.....	7,970			7,970	7,970	\$1,673,300	\$210	\$210
2. Seedskadee.....	60,720			60,720	60,720	23,272,000	383	383
3. Lyman.....		40,600	13,533	40,600	13,533	10,564,000	260	780
4. Silt.....	1,900	5,400	1,800	7,300	3,700	3,282,400	450	887
5. Smith Fork.....	2,270	8,160	2,720	10,430	4,990	3,343,000	321	670
6. Paonia.....	2,210	14,830	4,943	17,040	7,153	6,791,600	398	949
7. Florida.....	6,300	12,630	4,217	18,930	10,517	6,503,000	343	618
8. Pine River project extension.....	15,150			15,150	15,150	5,027,000	332	332
9. Emory County.....	3,630	20,450	6,817	24,080	10,447	9,636,500	400	922
10. Central Utah.....	28,540	131,840	43,947	160,380	72,487	127,354,000	794	1,757
11. Hammond.....	3,670			3,670	3,670	2,302,000	627	627
12. Gooseberry.....		16,400	5,467	16,400	5,467	5,727,500	349	1,047
Total.....	132,360	250,330	83,444	382,690	215,804	205,476,900	537	952

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we should add to the costs given in the table the interest costs. We have applied the ratio of 1.25 for interest as compared with one for principal. In this connection we should remember we have made no allowance for construction periods. If the construction period is 10 years, the period of no interest is 10 plus 10 plus 50, or 70 years. We have been using a lesser figure than that, in our desire to be fair to the sponsors of this project.

If the interest is added, the figures of costs of irrigation are as follows:

For the LaBarge project, \$472 an acre.
For the Seedskadee project, \$861 an acre.

For the Lyman project, \$1,755 an acre.
For the Silt project, \$1,995 an acre.
For the Smith Fork project, \$1,507 an acre.

For the Paonia project, \$2,135 an acre.
For the Florida project, \$1,490 an acre.
For the Pine River project extension, \$747 an acre.

For the Emory County project, \$2,074 an acre.
For the Central Utah project, \$3,953 an acre.

For the Hammond project, \$1,411 an acre.
For the Gooseberry project, \$2,355 an acre.

The grand average for the 12 projects is \$2,142 an acre.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre of irrigated land, including interest, in the 12 authorized participating projects be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Exhibit 1

La Barge.....	\$210×1.25=	\$262.50+	\$210=	\$472.50
Seedskadee.....	383×1.25=	478.75+	383=	861.75
Lyman.....	780×1.25=	975.00+	780=	1,755.00
Silt.....	887×1.25=	1,108.75+	887=	1,995.75
Smith Fork.....	670×1.25=	837.50+	670=	1,507.50
Paonia.....	949×1.25=	1,186.25+	949=	2,135.25
Florida.....	618×1.25=	772.50+	618=	1,490.50
Pine River project extension.....	332×1.25=	415.00+	332=	747.00
Emory County.....	922×1.25=	1,152.50+	922=	2,074.50
Central Utah.....	1,757×1.25=	2,196.25+	1,757=	3,953.25
Hammond.....	627×1.25=	783.75+	627=	1,410.75
Gooseberry.....	1,047×1.25=	1,308.75+	1,047=	2,355.75
Total.....	952×1.25=	1,190.00+	952=	2,142.00

IRRIGATED COSTS AN ACRE ARE 3 TO 4 TIMES HIGHER THAN THE VALUE OF AMERICA'S MOST FERTILE LAND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in my State of Illinois there is a belt of land which runs across the State, through what is known as central Illinois, continuing on into Iowa, which we believe is the most fertile natural land in the world. The price of this most fertile land in the world is now between \$600 and \$700 an acre. In the project now under discussion it is being proposed to use arid and semiarid land—and I shall go into the question of the crops which can be raised on that land in a moment—and to put that land under cultivation by the use of water, when in only one case will the cost be less than \$400 an acre, and that is the LaBarge project, which is a relatively small project. In only one other case would the cost be less than \$800 an acre. In one case the cost would be \$861 an acre. In the remaining nine projects the cost would be more than \$1,000 an acre. In the largest project of all, the central Utah project, the cost would be nearly \$4,000 an acre—six times the cost of the most fertile land in the world—all done in the name of development. Paraphrasing Madame Roland I say, "Development, development, what crimes have been committed in thy name."

IRRIGATED LAND TO BE USED FOR LOW-VALUE CROPS

What is to be grown on the land? The Senator from Utah yesterday challenged the Senator from Illinois as to the accuracy of his statement about the crops to be grown. I have before me an abstract, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, taken from the hearings, beginning on approximately page 60, and continuing for some 25 pages thereafter, which shows the crops to be raised.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, of the 16 projects reported, 8 of them were stated as being suitable for livestock only, through the raising of alfalfa and pasture. Seven were stated as being primarily for livestock, but with some vegetable and fruit production; but I believe such production is incidental. Ninety-five percent of the projects contemplate the production of alfalfa or grain or are intended directly or indirectly for the feeding of cattle. As a consequence, this land, after irrigation, will not be worth very much—probably not more than from \$100 to \$150 an acre—\$150 an acre at the outside. Yet we are being asked to make an average expenditure of \$2,000 an acre on land which, when the projects are finished, will sell for only \$150 an acre.

A BOONDOGGLE PROJECT

Mr. President, the WPA was attacked as a boondoggling operation, although I do not think it was boondoggling. But this proposal, so far as I am aware, is the biggest boondoggle I have ever heard of. Of course, the result will be, after the period of repayment is extended for 50 years, in addition to 10 years during which no payment is to be made, that even then the owners of the land can bear only 15 percent of the cost. Eighty-five percent of the cost will supposedly be laid on power, and on high-cost power—not low-cost power, as in the case of the Tennessee, the Columbia, or the Niagara, but on high-cost power, almost as high relatively as the Rocky Mountains themselves.

So, Mr. President, neither on the irrigation features nor on the power features is the expenditure of these vast sums of money justifiable.

WATER RESERVES AVERAGE THREE TIMES FLOW OF COLORADO RIVER

The third consideration is, of course, the water resources or water reserves. I do not pretend to be an expert on this question, although I have been in the Colorado Valley a number of times. The flow of the Colorado River in the past 10 years has been something less than 14 million acre-feet a year. The reserves contemplated in the big storage lakes lying behind the dams will be something over 43 million acre-feet, or about three times the average flow of the river. But this is not all, Mr. President. Seven and one-half million acre-feet, or half the flow—whichever we may wish to take—is pledged to the lower Colorado Valley, so that the amount available for the upper valley will not exceed 7½ million acre-

feet, or possibly a little less than that. Yet the reservoirs will hold 43 million acre-feet, or six times the amount of water to which the upper Colorado is annually entitled or which it can obtain. In view of the fact that the dam which is farthest down, namely, Glen Canyon Dam, will have to generate a great deal of power at almost full capacity in order to pay out, although I am not an expert, personally I would be very doubtful whether these reservoirs would even be largely filled. In order to fill the Glen Canyon Reservoir it may not be possible to fill Echo Park Reservoir and the others.

The point I should like to make is that the reservoir capacity of the project is grossly overpledged, with enormous capital outlays which will not be utilized.

PROJECT PAID FOR BY STATES NOT BENEFITED

Mr. President, who is going to bear the cost of all this? It will not come out of the air. I think we are in for great and heavy losses in this region, and the burden will be borne by the taxpayers of the country as a whole. Only 2 percent of the burden will be borne by the taxpayers of these four States. It will be the great industrial States of the country, whose citizens pay the largest proportion of the Federal income and corporation taxes, which will bear the great part of the burden. The drawing down of the income of the rest of the country will diminish their ability to consume and hence to stimulate industry. These are the unseen costs which far outweigh the benefits derived from this project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, and I think I know what the question is going to be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois is mistaken. He asked a question, and I should like to answer it, briefly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Wyoming answer it, if he does so briefly, so that the flow of my argument may be preserved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has asked, "Who is going to pay for this?" In reply, let me state that it will not be paid for by the taxpayers of the country as a whole, not by the taxpayers of Illinois or New York or Pennsylvania, but it will be paid for out of the wealth which will be developed in this great storehouse of natural resources through which the Colorado River has been flowing, unused, for millions of years, until the Congress of the United States, with the vision to see that the water could be put to productive uses, authorized the Colorado River compact and the building of the dams. That is where the payment will arise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Wyoming. His eloquence is always charming, and at times is almost overwhelming. But, Mr. President, even the eloquence of the Senator cannot overcome

the facts of high power costs, enormously higher irrigation costs than the subsequent value of the land, and the tremendous losses which in all probability will be suffered by the community if it launches upon these projects.

No, Mr. President; I say to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that the cost of these projects will not be paid for by the wealth of this particular region. It will be the governmental deficits, the forgiving of interest, and the burdens heaped upon the rest of the country which will pay the cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for another moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be happy to yield, provided it is only for a few moments, and provided the Senator from Wyoming does not attempt to take the floor away from me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not do so, and I did not attempt to do so before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming did not attempt to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And I shall not attempt to do so now. But, Mr. President, when the time comes for me to take the floor, to speak my piece about this matter, I shall display to the Senator from Illinois, and to other Senators who may be willing to listen, photographs which will show what the lower Colorado River Basin was before the dams were built, and what it is now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply to my good friend from Wyoming, that I do not wish to enter into a discussion as between the claims of the lower Colorado River States and the claims of the upper Colorado River States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not raise that controversy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so understand and I do not wish to enter into it, and I do not wish to have it thought that I am advocating the claims of Arizona, California, or Nevada in this respect. But I should like to point out that the irrigation projects of California and Arizona to which the Senator from Wyoming has referred are in low altitudes, with long growing seasons and extraordinarily rich land, so that, when water was turned upon those projects at an earlier date and at low cost, the total investment has probably in the main been beneficial, although not in all cases.

But in this case we are being asked to irrigate lands in the uplands, at altitudes between 5,000 and 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, and where the chief products will be hay, corn, livestock, and alfalfa. These are low-value crops.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to ask a question at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can see that, as usual, I have stirred up the lions, in the form of my two dear friends who now are encircling me.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, Mr. President; I only wish to ask a question. I have

been hearing the constantly repeated statements of the Senator from Illinois that the land in California and Arizona is so fertile, and that the land in the area of these projects is so infertile. Has the Senator from Illinois ever examined a map of the United States dated about 1860, and seen on it the area which was labeled "The Great American Desert"? Yuma was about the capital of it. The very areas about which the Senator is speaking, which are so fertile today—areas such as the Coachella Valley and the Salt River Valley—were so bare that the areas in northern New Mexico looked like a paradise. It is possible to change that picture by putting water on the land. That is what has happened at Yuma. There was not a blade of grass at Yuma prior to the building of the project there. The soil is not a particle different from other areas along the Colorado River. On my own farm in New Mexico, there are areas which were formerly known as the Hubbell Lakes. We plowed up the sand in this area and eventually turned the land into fertile acres. I believe a similar distinction should be made in discussing the types of soil in this debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me touch briefly on this point. Am I not correct in saying that nearly all these proposed irrigation projects are at an altitude greater than a mile? I think one of them is at an altitude of 4,500 feet.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The one in Wyoming is as high as 7,500 feet. At these altitudes the winters are long and cold and the summers short.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that is so; but at the same time, it is also true that hay is valuable when it is scarce. I had some alfalfa which, last fall, was worth only \$20 a ton. In the past few days I have received telephone calls offering from \$45 to \$50 a ton, because hay is scarce in other areas, and has finally become scarce in the Rio Grande Valley.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad my good friend from New Mexico is now implicitly admitting that hay and alfalfa are to be the chief crops grown on these irrigation projects.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has anyone been denying that these lands would be agricultural lands?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] denied that yesterday. He implied that forage crops would not be the chief products.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. He pointed out that other products would be grown. All I am trying to say to the Senator from Illinois is that grass is not the worst crop that can be grown for the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All service ranks with God. All crops are beautiful and valuable; but grass is a relatively low-value crop.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Illinois will write to his experiment station he will find that within the past few months there was published a document dealing with the products to which grass can contribute, and the value which grass has, pointing out that 6½

tons of grass was recently taken off a pasture. This document was published in either the Farm Journal or Successful Farming within the past 6 months. I believe the Senator from Illinois ought to go back and persuade his farmers in Illinois who are getting 6½ tons of grass to the acre that they are doing wrong—that they ought to be growing high-value crops, which the Senator from Illinois says they should find desirable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main, we grow very high-value crops in Illinois. Primarily we grow corn and soybeans. We grow a little wheat, but primarily corn and soybeans. Not much hay is being grown in the great central belt of Illinois. That Illinois land, the highest valued land in the country, is worth only \$600 to \$700 an acre. However, in the upper Colorado, in the central Utah project, it is proposed to spend \$4,000 an acre for land which, when we are through, will be worth \$150.

MOST PROFITABLE IRRIGATION IS ON FERTILE
LAND

I should like to mention one further point. I have said that if we wish to develop hydroelectric power we should not go to the Colorado, but to the Columbia, the Snake, and the Niagara. If we wish to obtain a greater yield of crops, we should not try to bring additional acres of arid or semiarid land into cultivation at enormous cost, but we should put a little water on the fertile lands already in cultivation and raise the output per acre still further.

Yesterday I referred to a recent article by Paul B. Sears, an eminent geographer, who some years ago wrote a very fascinating book entitled "Deserts on the March." This article appears in the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. It shows that if we put additional water on the lands of Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio, upper New York, and the Cotton States of the Mississippi Delta, at a cost of from \$30 to \$60 an acre—I believe in no case more than \$100 an acre—we can obtain vastly greater production than by putting water on the arid lands of the Mountain States at a cost of many hundreds of dollars an acre.

So if we wish to enter upon a program of putting water on land to increase the acreage yield, let us do it on the already rich lands by taking water from the great rivers of the country, notably the Mississippi, the Hudson, and the Connecticut, and possibly the Great Lakes, although international complications might arise in that instance in connection with the level of the lakes.

RECREATION VALUE OF UNDEVELOPED AREAS

Having discussed power, irrigation, and water reserves, I wish now to touch upon one final point. I refer to the point of recreation. That subject is involved, not at Glen Canyon, but at Echo Park, because the Echo Park Dam would flood a large portion of Dinosaur National Monument. This monument was started on a very small scale 40 years ago. The purpose was to protect the paleontological remains of the prehistoric dinosaurs which once roamed this region, believe it or not, and whose skeletons have been encased for all time in the rocks of this

region, where they are visible from the canyon walls. By order of President Roosevelt, the very small reservation was extended to include a total of approximately 210,000 acres.

I wish to make it clear that the preservation of the dinosaur remains is not involved in the Echo Park Dam. They are downstream from the dam. They will not be flooded. It is very important to make that clear in the RECORD.

I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] bows to me at that point. However, I hope he will not regard this as an unusual performance on my part, because I at least try never to overstate my case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question, or for a brief comment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to acknowledge what the Senator has just now said. There is no Member of this body for his true sincerity, ability, and diligence I have greater respect than I have for the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am sure he knows that to be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are close and fast personal friends, and always will remain so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator very much. That is a very great compliment to me.

I was happy indeed to have the Senator say explicitly upon the floor that the dinosaur quarry will not be touched by any arm of this project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, I wish to add—and this is why I bowed to the Senator—that those who are taking the position he takes in opposing this project are seeking to condemn the upper basin of the Colorado as the graveyard of the dinosaurs, not to be developed, not to be inhabited, not to be used by the American people who are seeking land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That brings us to the point upon which I wish to touch. What will be affected by the Echo Park Dam is not the dinosaurs, but the beautiful, all-inspiring, tremendous canyons which lie in this region. The Echo Park Dam is to be 525 feet high, and the water level is supposed to approximate a level 10 or 15 feet below that. In other words, there will be a depth of approximately 500 feet, provided everything turns out as the sponsors suggest, although I have previously indicated my doubt as to whether there will be sufficient water to raise the lake level above 500 feet. But let us take the claims at their face value. That means that the beautiful canyon there will be submerged for a great many miles, and there will be a placid lake in its stead.

I know that there is an honest difference of opinion on this last question. I know that those who live in the mountains and in the wide-open spaces of this region have nature in plentitude. They are surrounded by nature. They see the beautiful mountains with the occasional snow-capped peaks. They drive enormous distances, by eastern and even middle western standards, to see their friends. They experience hail storms and snow storms, and occasionally a

little rain, though not too much rain. Nature is all about them. They have so much of it that it does not have too great an attraction for them. To the splendid outdoor residents of this region, men and women brimming over with vitality and virility, the preservation of a set of canyons does not seem particularly important.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has correctly stated that we have little rain. These are the semiarid land States we are speaking about.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to him; "Pity us. Let us store the rainwater which for thousands of years has been rolling down the Colorado Valley without use. Let us save it. Let us keep it for awhile. Please have some pity on the area, which is the arid land area of the country. It wants to conserve the great natural supply of water which the Almighty placed there, for man to use, if he has the intelligence and the courage to use it."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming, with his characteristic eloquence, is now making an appeal for pity. Pity is not the most desirable of human qualities. Friendship is better than pity. Of course the Senator from Wyoming is so superior to the Senator from Illinois that I cannot pity him. I look up to him, not down at him. I have for the Senator from Wyoming, as for all the Senators from this mountain area, the warmest friendship. I should like to help them. But the Senator in his appeal that the rest of the country be merciful to those arid or semiarid States has forced me to say something I had hoped I would not be compelled to say. It is that already the rest of the country is paying through the nose for the 16 votes which the great Mountain States have in the United States Senate. It is a region with a population of only 5 million, representing only about 3 percent of the population of the whole country. However, that region has 16 percent of the representation in the United States Senate.

The Senators from those States are fine gentlemen, able Senators, good ambassadors from their States, and they are able to secure the enactment of legislation which enormously benefits their States at the expense of the rest of the country.

LIST OF BENEFITS RECEIVED BY MOUNTAIN STATES

Let me call the roll for a minute. Reclamation, with interest forgiven. Sometimes I think the arid and semiarid States enter into joint combinations with the States of the lower Mississippi in a process of rolling each other's logs, the States of the lower Mississippi getting big appropriations for rivers and occasionally for harbors, and the States in the mountain areas getting appropriations for reclamation, but in neither case is interest being paid, and in the case of the lower Mississippi States not even principal is being returned for the land that is reclaimed by the deepening of the Mississippi.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was citing specific instances in which we have been extremely generous to the Mountain States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois was in full flight with a very eloquent castigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He spoke of the Senators from the arid States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I insist I was not. I merely pointed out—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the Senator not indulging in a little castigation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not in the slightest; no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did he not refer to logrolling?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Strike out logrolling. Strike out "logrolling", and insert instead "mutual and tacit agreement upon essential features which will benefit the respective areas."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator, speaking for the State of Wyoming, that the oil revenues of the Federal Government from that State have produced millions of dollars for the Reclamation Service. From this arid ground, upon which I would like to spread a little water, we have produced great quantities of oil, and that oil—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not said that water and oil do not mix?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We can mix them if only the Senator from Illinois will devote his great talents to our cause. I believe he will before we have finished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was just beginning to call the roll of the great benefits which the rest of the country has conferred upon this region. I believe the Senators from those States have not been passive on such issues.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator will permit me to say that the people of those States are people of high standards.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. They are worthy Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, they are but so also are the people of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New York, and the other States of the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know many people in my State who came from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And they probably have regretted it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should hesitate to say that. They are in Wyoming and in the other Rocky Mountain States, where there is the plentitude of nature to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. We have certain great advantages which the teeming cities of the East do not have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. That is a point I shall come to, if the Senator will be forbearing enough to let me continue my remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator will permit me to go to lunch now. We can continue this exchange when I return and I take the floor in my own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Having been attacked by Wyoming, I now yield to New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not for the purpose of attacking the Senator. I listened very carefully to what the Senator from Illinois said about a tacit agreement between the States of the lower Mississippi Valley, under which we have voted sums of money for flood control to them, and they in turn have taken care of our reclamation projects.

I merely wish to state for the record that never in my life has a Senator from the lower Mississippi Valley approached me and asked me to vote for a flood-control project, with the understanding that he in turn would vote for a reclamation project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I echo what the Senator from New Mexico has stated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Never have I gone to a Senator from any one of those States and told him that I would vote for a flood-control project if he in turn would vote for a reclamation project.

It is a rather serious reflection upon the Senators from the Western States and upon Senators from the lower Mississippi Valley States, and I believe that the Senator from Illinois ought to produce evidence that such an arrangement has been entered into if he makes that charge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not charge that any open agreement was ever entered into. I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico, who is a highly honorable man, never entered into such an agreement. I merely wish to say that frequently there has been a tacit understanding, which is sometimes more binding than a definite pledge.

The Senator from Wyoming had been making a plea for mercy. In a sense, since he has left the floor, what I have to say may seem to be taking advantage of his absence. However, it was by his choice, not by mine, that he absented himself.

In addition to the reclamation funds which are appropriated from the taxes contributed by the rest of the country and on which no interest is paid, when those reclamation funds are repaid, they do not go back into the General Treasury. Instead, they are used for further reclamation projects. Therefore, when the original appropriation is made for irrigation from tax funds, it is gone forever.

To paraphrase the old miner's song, Oh, My Darling Clementine, the irrigation money once appropriated is lost and gone forever no matter how dreadfully sorry we may be, it will avail us nothing.

In addition to the funds voted for reclamation, we purchase as a government every year, as I remember, approximately \$30 million of silver. That is a big subsidy to the silver mining industry of the Western States. I am aware of the fact that the silver is purchased at less than the amount at which silver is minted into silver coins or is used as a reserve for silver notes. However, we could use Federal Reserve notes at a cost of 1 cent per dollar, and save 49 cents. So, we are virtually keeping the silver mining industry going, keeping up the

price of silver, and striking a heavy blow at the jewelry industry of the country in so doing. We are raising the price of the silver sets which the young brides have to have when they start house-keeping, and we are raising the price of jewelry in the city of North Attleboro and other manufacturing cities in New England.

Then, Mr. President, there is the high price of sugar, maintained, in part, as a subsidy for the canesugar growers of Louisiana but also for the beet-sugar growers of Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Then there is the price support upon wool, not at 75 percent, as Mr. Benson would have the price support on corn and wheat, but more than 100 percent; I believe it is 110 or 120 percent of parity.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] says, sotto voce, that it is maintained between 105 and 110 percent. It would be much cheaper if we obtained our wool from Australia; but, no; we maintain a high price to keep the wool growers of the Mountain States in business.

Then, of course, we help to maintain the cattle industry in those States, because, somehow, the Argentine cattle never pass the health tests, and, as a result, cheap Argentine beef is kept out of the United States.

I am not tilting against windmills in this matter, but when the Senator from Wyoming implied that the rest of the country was being mean to the Mountain States, I thought a full record should be made on that point. I would say that if these supports were not held up, directly and indirectly, for the Mountain States, the population of that area would decrease and the prosperity of that area would decline.

The country is already paying through the nose for the support of those States. By the terms of the Constitution they have great political power, with equality of representation in the Senate, which cannot be changed, against which I do not protest, but which it is not unpatriotic to point out.

RECREATION VALUE OF UNDEVELOPED NATURAL AREAS

Mr. President, let us go back to the fourth point, namely recreation. What would be affected by the Echo Park Dam would not be the remains of the dinosaurs, but the destruction of the deep canyons, enormously deep, with swift-flowing rivers, even with relatively low-water content, and high, towering cliffs. I have not had the privilege of taking a canoe trip through that portion of the Colorado River. I have seen photographs of it, and I have seen a brief movie of it. I have on two occasions been down to the very depths of the Grand Canyon and pitched a tent there and lived there for a weekend. It is, of course, one of the great sights of the country.

It is highly important for persons who live in closely packed centers, who live in the great cities, to be able to visit places of natural beauty which are awe-inspiring, which give to man a sense of his littleness in the presence of the mighty forces of nature, which cause his

imagination to go back into the deep aeons of time, and enable him to feel the exhilaration which comes from personal knowledge that nature is powerful and that man is mighty little. This is something which we city folks lack in our ordinary lives and which the people of the Western States always have. How inestimably richer the country is because of the great national parks which have been constructed, such as the Yosemite, the Yellowstone, Ranier, Glacier, the Smokies, and perhaps most of all, the Grand Canyon.

I have been in most of those parks. As a young man I used to tramp through some of them in the summertime. Those summer experiences are some of the features of my life upon which I look back with the most intense pleasure and the greatest deepening of consciousness. But these parks, as we all know, are now being overused and are overcrowded. I have not had the opportunity or the time to visit Yosemite Park or to go into Yellowstone Park or Glacier Park in recent years, but I receive letters from my constituents regarding them. The universal complaint about these parks, and, indeed, about the park at Mt. Ranier, is that they are overcrowded and badly maintained, particularly in the past few years. There are swarms of people there. Therefore, some of the glory of the parks is being rubbed off by overuse. Millions of distraught city folks, pressured by the strain of city life, are not getting the exhilaration and revivification which contact with nature brings.

The Dinosaur National Monument has opportunities in this direction if properly developed. It has enormous canyons where, with proper trails and roads, people can go down to the very bottom, where others can take canoes and float down the river and have a quickening of life from contact with the awe inspiring

features of nature. A sense of humility and of peace would come to them.

This would be largely lost if the canyons were to be replaced by a placid lake. I know there are those who say that a lake is just as recreational as a deep gorge. I have spent a day on Lake Mead, which is back of Boulder Dam. I would say that in the case of Lake Mead it has not decreased the recreational facilities of the region, but has greatly improved them.

But, certainly, Mr. President, we should keep some wild places. We need these wild places to enable and benefit the human spirit. Dinosaur National Monument could, with proper development, become such a place. What is going to become of this country if we dam every stream and create placid lakes in every portion where wild water formerly flowed. We shall reduce the entire country to a stale, tepid, flatulent level, good for weekend excursions with a picnic basket, but with the sternness of nature, the awe-inspiring cliffs and scenery, obliterated. Excellent as chautauqua is would we like to have the whole country converted into an extensive chautauqua?

If that should happen, a great glory would have passed out of the country. This, I think, is what the Bureau of Reclamation, with the best intentions in the world, is seeking to do. It is trying to dam all the streams, install power, provide irrigation, displace the gorges, and turn scenery into the growing of hay and corn and the production of electricity—all well in their own way, but not all of life, because men must live by something more than beefsteak and fruit. As our population increases, the need for such wild places will be still greater.

There is another feature about the proposed project. If a power dam shall be erected in the Dinosaur National Monument, may we not have power dams

in Yosemite, in Yellowstone, and in Glacier National Park? The National Park Service has been fighting a rear-guard action for many years to keep the Bureau of Reclamation out of these areas. If the wall is broken, or if the foot goes in the door, we can be pretty certain that it will be harder to resist the raids when they are made, as they will be made, on the other national parks of the country.

SUMMARY

So, Mr. President, the upper Colorado project from any standpoint is unjustifiable. It is unjustifiable on the basis of power, because it contemplates about the highest cost power that could be generated. It is unjustifiable on the basis of irrigation, because the costs are astronomical compared with the benefits. It is of extremely doubtful value on the basis of the actual amount of water which will be put in reserve as compared with the reserve capacity behind the dams.

The upper Colorado project would cripple the recreational features of the country and tend to transform the Nation physically, into a placid, tepid place, greatly unlike the wild and stirring America which we love and from which we draw inspiration.

Thus, while I have the friendliest feeling for the Senators from that region, who in defending the interests of their States are doing something which is very natural, I hope that the Senate of the United States and the other House as well, will disapprove this project in its entirety.

In yielding the floor, I now ask unanimous consent that certain data which I shall submit may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The data are as follows:

Exhibit 2

Project	Acres	Chief crops
LaBarge project, Wyoming (p. 59).....	7,970 new; no supplemental.....	Hay, pasture, small grain, dairy cows, and sheep. Project lands would generally be utilized for support of livestock enterprises.
Seedskadee project, Wyoming (p. 61).....	60,720 new; no supplemental.....	Hay, pasture, and small grain, dairy cows, and sheep. With project development, the irrigated lands would be utilized primarily for the support of livestock enterprises, particularly dairy cows and sheep.
Lyman project, Wyoming (p. 62).....	40,600 supplemental; no new.....	Hay, pasture, small grain, dairy cows, and beef cattle. Only grasses for hay and pasture, alfalfa, and some small grains can be produced to any extent because of short growing season.
Silt project, Colorado (p. 65).....	1,900 new; 5,400 supplemental.....	Alfalfa, small grains, sugar beets, potatoes, dairy cows, and beef cattle. Would increase with late season water.
Smith Fork project, Colorado (p. 68).....	2,270 new; 8,160 supplemental.....	Alfalfa, pasture, grains, dairy cows, and beef stock.
Paonia project, Colorado (p. 70).....	2,210 new; 14,830 supplemental.....	Alfalfa, grain, apples, peaches, dairy cows, and beef cattle.
Florida project, Colorado (p. 72).....	New: 900 Indian; 5,400 new non-Indian; supplemental: 100 Indian; 12,550 non-Indian.	Alfalfa, grain, dairy cows, beef cattle, largely livestock, some beans, potatoes, and fruits.
Pine River project, Colorado and New Mexico (p. 75).....	New: 14,520 Colorado; 630, New Mexico.	Utilized largely for support of livestock.
Emery County project, Utah (p. 72).....	3,630 new; 20,450 supplemental.....	Livestock, some small farming, 90 percent of area produce hay and grain for livestock.
Central Utah project, Utah (p. 78).....	28,540 new; 131,840 supplemental.....	Alfalfa, grain, fruit, vegetables, sugar beets, beef cattle, and sheep.
Hammond project, New Mexico (p. 85).....	3,670 new.....	Alfalfa, corn, beans, barley, dairy cows, and sheep.
Eden project, Wyoming (p. 87).....	10,660 new; 9,540 supplemental.....	Hay, pasture, dairy cows, and beef.
Curecanti project, Colorado (p. 88).....	Power unit.....	
Gooseberry project, Utah (p. 91).....	16,400 supplemental.....	95 percent alfalfa, pasture.
Navaho project (p. 95).....	137,250 new Indian land.....	Alfalfa, grain, pasture, some fruit and vegetables.
San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico (p. 96).....	225,000 supplemental.....	Municipal and industrial use.

SUMMARY

Projects reported.....	16
Stated as being for livestock only—alfalfa, pasture, etc.....	8
Stated as being for livestock with some vegetable and fruit production.....	7
Stated as power unit.....	1

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] well knows, there are very few issues which seem to divide us. I rejoice in that fact. But I must say that upon this issue I find it impossible to refrain from commenting on some of the things which have been said.

I agree fully with what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said with reference to the delightful Senator from Illinois, namely, that he is fair; that he tries always to present a fair picture.

The only things I desire to comment on, although I shall deal with agriculture at substantial length later, are some of the inferences which have to do with the character of soil. If the fine, rich, fertile soils which have been referred to were always the sources of the greatest agricultural returns, we would find record crops being produced each year in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and, yes, in Pennsylvania and similar areas.

Strangely enough, some years ago there was a discussion of the areas which raised surpluses of potatoes. For reasons which many persons may recall, I had a deep interest in the surplus of potatoes. It was found that the great surplus was being grown not in the areas which had been the normally large producers of potatoes, but was coming in large measure, from the State of California. The record yield of potatoes, which only a short time before had been in Lancaster County, Pa., one of

the richest of the agricultural counties in the United States, had suddenly shown up in Kern County, Calif. Whereas the area in Pennsylvania had set a record of some 150 bushels of potatoes to the acre, it was only necessary to sit back for a few years until Kern County, Calif., in the desert sand, produced 1,400 bushels to the acre.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], now occupying the chair of the majority leader, has in his State a small valley called Pahrump Valley. Only a few years ago that valley was a desert of marching sands, which Paul Sears talks about. A group of farmers had the courage to go into that valley and try to make it an agricultural empire. Today the valley has an agricultural production which can equal anything that can be done in what were the old fertile areas.

I am not opposed to increasing agricultural production in other parts of the United States, as well, because I say that this land of ours will need greater agricultural production if the population continues to increase.

I only point out that the areas which we regard as desert finally end by becoming extremely fertile land, and that light soils, even though they be very largely sandy, respond to certain types of crops. Farmers now think nothing of getting a production of 150 bushels of oats to the acre in irrigated areas.

As to the parks, let me say that there are many, including myself, who have a record for supporting, maintaining, and protecting the park system of the United States. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when, in the first few years of World War II, an effort was made to economize in almost every possible direction, and the appropriation bills which came to the floor of the House carried very drastically reduced appropriations for the national parks. A group of Members from the Rocky Mountain States, Republicans and Democrats alike, gathered together and, at my insistence, decided that we would fight for the parks and for appropriations which would protect and preserve them during the period of the war emergency. We succeeded in having our amendments carried and in raising the appropriations by narrow margins, thus taking care of the parks of the Nation during the period of the war.

There exists in my State a fine national park known as Carlsbad Caverns. That park was owned at one time by the State of New Mexico. A group of individuals, of whom I was happy to be one, felt that ownership of that park should be transferred to the United States Government. It was transferred by the State of New Mexico to the Government of the United States and thus became part of the national park system. Not 1 cent was paid by the United States to the State of New Mexico to acquire it; yet if one will examine the returns from the national parks, he will find that Carlsbad Caverns has been a bread winner for the other parks in the national park system, because Carlsbad Caverns has returned a profit to the Federal Government year after year, and that profit has been used for the benefit of the other parks.

We in New Mexico have not regretted

that. We are happy that Carlsbad Caverns has been able to accomplish this purpose.

I merely point out that there are some Members who have been interested in the park situation for a long time; that there are some of us interested in the preservation of wilderness areas.

I can say that when, about 6 months ago, the Wilderness Society decided to dedicate a plaque to Waldo Leopold, who had taken the leadership in the development of the first wilderness area under the Park Service of the United States, the society did not have to go outside the State of New Mexico to find an individual who, they thought, deserved to make the address on that occasion. They chose me to speak because it had been my privilege to go into the area when an effort had been made to destroy the wilderness. I think I was the only elected public official who faced the proponents of division and said they could not invade the Gila Wilderness.

So I say, from long experience, that I do not regard myself as an enemy of the Park Service, nor an enemy of the national parks, nor an individual who tries to destroy the wilderness areas of America.

Today, however, I am very anxious to talk about another facet of this matter—farm surpluses and the whole problem that is posed by a series of bills which I hope will come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am hoping these bills will deal with the subject of irrigation development of additional lands and the production of additional crops, which I think will be badly needed.

Very soon, within the next 10 years, according to a study made by the Department of Agriculture as late as 1953, we may well be speaking of farm shortages, and the need for an adequate supply of farm lands. Crop surpluses will have vanished.

How can this be? I am going to do my best to show my colleagues. I am speaking as a former Secretary of Agriculture and as a man who has had a rather extensive association with the food problems of the United States and the world.

Part of what I have to say will be based upon my experiences as chairman of the World Food Board a few years ago, and upon the knowledge I gained in food matters as chairman of the United States delegation to Quebec in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization. Certain conclusions I will draw will rest, in part, upon facts I gathered as United States War Food Administrator, and later as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Sometimes the things we keep may not be of significance to anyone but ourselves, but they are found to be interesting later. Shortly after becoming Secretary of Agriculture I asked what was going to happen when the wars finally ceased and agriculture was placed on a wholly different basis in a peacetime economy.

We created in the Department of Agriculture a long-range planning committee. We charged it with the responsibility of surveying what had happened after every great war, not only in this country but abroad. We asked it to

make a study of what might happen to food habits of the people of this country, what was happening to the soil of the Nation, what unusual burdens were being placed upon it during the war period, and what we might expect in the years that would follow?

April 21 and October 6, 7, and 8, 1947, testimony on those subjects was presented to the Congress for the formulation of a long-range policy and program. I refer to that only because in the preparation of the report of the hearings we had to prepare a balance sheet. Opposite page 12 of the hearings, that balance sheet is set forth. We tried to survey, through every available governmental organization, every acre of ground about which we had any knowledge whatever. We tried to ascertain how many acres were suitable for intertilling, how many acres were fit for grazing only, and how many acres were suitable for forests only. In general, we tried to see what the general land pattern should be.

This was the work of the Department of Agriculture, of the Soil Conservation Service, and of the Department of the Interior. We queried every available official we could find. We then began making a study of diets, and a study to ascertain what would be the economic and agricultural needs of this country if the people ate the foods they ought to consume in order to produce fine and sturdy children.

We found that if the land then in cultivation were cultivated in the fashion best designed to preserve and conserve it, not having pastures plowed which should not be plowed, we would produce only enough for the people of the United States to eat, if they were going to eat the diet they should, at the right time of the year. We learned that within only a few years we would not be producing enough to meet our needs.

Most of the figures I quote, and nearly all of the facts I intend to outline, will be drawn from documents which Senators can check for themselves. I shall attempt to list them as I go along.

I have asked the question: How is it possible to have food shortages within 10 years when today we are speaking of food surpluses?

First of all, though, let us define the extent of our present surplus. We do not have an overabundance of most foods. We do have an oversupply of certain crops. One of them, cotton, is not edible, although some of its byproducts are. And, believe it or not, the United States imports some foods important to our diets.

So we can scale down the overall picture of surpluses right from the start. The foods now in oversupply soon will be used up, if present population trends continue. The first way in which we can predict that farm surpluses will vanish is through population increases, more people eating more food.

John H. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of Commodity Marketing and Adjustment, and president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, made a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on July 31, 1953, in which he said:

Looking ahead, say to 1960, we are likely to have a population total close to 175 million people. And if our rate of economic growth

continues as it has in the past, the average person should have a level of living at least 15 percent above that of today. Such a rise in the general level of living for this higher population total would mean greatly expanded domestic markets for food and other farm products produced by our agriculture.

And even if the people we will have in our country by 1960 consume food and other farm products at the same rate as in 1952, our domestic consumption of farm products would then be 9 percent higher than in 1952. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952 as well as greatly increased quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other products.

I want to stress that * * * over many years there has been a very distinct trend in this country to upgrade diets. This desire to expand food consumption and improve nutrition will express itself as long as our people continue to have adequate buying power.

I have been reading from a speech by Mr. John H. Davis, who said that, based on a population of 175 million people by 1960, that was exactly the point where we would find a balance existing between what this country could produce by sound agricultural policies and what the diet of the people of the country would require.

More can be said about population. Its growth in the next 10 years was predicted by Dr. Grover W. Ensley, staff director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, who said here last October 25:

On the basis of present fertility rates, our population can be expected to increase to about 190 million persons by 1965, compared with just under 160 million in 1953 and something over 162 million today. * * * The effect of these population changes during the next decade will be to increase the demand for food.

Mr. President, I have not tried to bring to the Senate floor today a library which deals solely with the problem we are discussing. I have, however, picked up three books from my own library which deal in a minor way with the problem. One of them is a book by Robert C. Cook, entitled "Human Fertility: The Modern Dilemma." I should like to read from that book, beginning at page 321:

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization frankly admits that in spite of local surpluses of food in North America, on a global basis the per-capita ration is smaller today than it was in 1940.

The evil does not stop there. The world's growing population will force the use of marginal lands, which in general are extremely expensive to exploit. More and more human energy will have to be devoted to the basic problem of producing food, and the standard of living, instead of going up, will remain at the subsistence level in the areas where it now stands at that level, while the wealthier areas will find their standards of living declining. Already the pressures of population in most parts of the world have compelled an unwise exploitation of the good lands. Erosion has become a world-wide problem.

Mr. President, I listened while the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] talked about using these lands, which are not the most fertile in the Nation. Yet, as Mr. Cook, the author of *Human Fertility* states, the world's growing pop-

ulation will force us to use the world's marginal lands; and of course he is as accurate as can be. A little later in his book he says:

In Japan the multiplication of those in want has now reached the point where each day it grows more doubtful whether the industry and technical skills of the people can ever bring about a balance of mouths and of loaves.

Then, Mr. President, if we consider the calculations of population which are made in this text, we find that the author believes that starting with the 1950 population of 2.3 billion, the population of the world will double by the year 2020, and then again will double in another 70 years, and finally will reach the figure of approximately 10 billion persons on this planet. Of course, it takes only 30, 40, or 50 years to reach a figure which already puts in jeopardy all our agricultural lands. That is why I say that the Senators who represent the western States, which are interested in this problem, are not interested in it only as it exists today, but are interested in what will happen 20, 30, or 40 years from now.

Mr. President, I now call attention to the fact—and later I shall refer to it again—that in dealing with this problem, we are dealing with a proposal to construct dams and irrigation projects which will not be completed in 30 or 40 years.

At this time I should like to refer to a book entitled "Population on the Loose," by Elmer Pendell. In it we find the following:

The population of the rice-eating areas has increased by nearly 100 million people in the 1939-49 decade—about 10 percent.

Mr. President, recently we were trying to ship a great deal of rice to other countries of the world. Then we found that temporarily a sufficient supply existed there. But if this trend continues, and if the rice-eating areas continue to grow by 100 million people in a decade, or if perhaps they have a substantially greater growth than that, then we shall face some real problems in a very short period of time.

Finally, Mr. President, I read from the same book the following passage appearing on page 45:

As their population becomes dense in relation to soil, the inhabitants have to give a larger and larger proportion of their energy to the production of food for themselves.

Yes, Mr. President, the story by expert after expert is that we have some great problems; and in a few minutes I shall have more to say about population and its effect on the supply of food.

But there is already present in the picture a factor which should be mentioned now, because it increases the seriousness of the problem we face as our population grows and our food consumption goes up. That factor is the Nation's supply of farm land. It appears—and I shall tell you, Mr. President, where I gathered my facts—that we shall be faced with a demand for more food at a time when our total farm acreage is decreasing.

Volume I of the President's Materials Policy Commission Report in June, 1952, says the United States will need 40 percent more food production by 1975 than

it had in 1950. But it estimates that during that interval, 15 million acres of farm land will be lost in the construction of airports, highways, cities, and other nonproductive activities. I say nonproductive in terms of a source of food supply—not that cities are not productive in other ways. In that period we shall also be losing 25 million acres of land to soil erosion.

So here we are, Mr. President, needing 40 percent more production at the same time we are losing 40 million acres of farmland. The situation is not hopeless, thanks to technological advances in agriculture and increasing yields per acre; but, as we can see, the situation is not good at all.

In passing, let me make this observation: We can improve the use of our lands, we can farm every available inch, and still fall short. We can do the best we know how, and fail. We can do much worse than we know how, and create a crisis close to treason. What did Ghandi say? "To the millions who go without two meals a day the only way God dare appear is in food."

Mr. President, can you imagine Americans that short of food?

I say that while we are deeply concerned with conditions in other parts of the world, we should concern ourselves with the development of these United States lands, which offer a possibility of adding to the food supply of America—not now, to be sure, but 20, 30, or 40 years from now, which is when this land will come to its greatest usefulness.

Mr. President, Walter Prescott Webb, author of *The Great Frontier*, which was published only 3 years ago, has this to say of the productivity of farmland:

The land has only so much to offer, and when it is crowded, it has less to offer each one * * * regardless of any techniques which may be developed to extract more from the land, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. And if our techniques speed up the process of utilization and destruction, as they are now doing, they hasten the day when the substance * * * on which a swollen population temporarily subsists will approach scarcity or exhaustion.

We can look to the crowded nations of the world to see what Mr. Webb had in mind. Food, to the teeming lands of China and India, the miniature gardens of Japan and Europe, holds a different meaning than it ever has held in this country.

It might be said that we are talking in terms of guesses. That is true; but if our guesses sound too high, think back about 5 years. The 1950 census was being completed, and the experts were estimating a 1975 population of 175 million persons. I have already read to you estimates which place the figure at 190 million—estimates revised in 5 years of zooming birth rates and longer lives for the aged. The Census Bureau placed the Nation's population at the end of March—only about 3 weeks ago—at more than 161 million persons. This represents an increase of 400,000 individuals in 1 month—or more than 13,000 per day.

In the next 20 years there will be 7,300 days. If we multiply 7,300 by 13,000, we

get 94,900,000. Add 94 million persons to the total today, and we get 255 million United States citizens by 1975. So it can be seen that our figures are decidedly conservative.

Mr. President, all these remarks are preliminary to what I really came here to say; they are a sort of introduction to certain facts already demanding attention. They indicate—today—that food surpluses are beginning to solve themselves. How? First, through population increase; second, through increasing consumption by the individual; third, through the usual inroads of drought, insects, and day-to-day farming hazards.

Our surplus stocks of certain items have not increased at the old rate during the past 2 years, although production has been at an all-time high. At my request the Agriculture Department checked its figures, and found that the rate of increase in surplus commodities is leveling off. It found that consumption has been gaining on production, and that in these surplus commodities, a balance soon will be achieved.

Officials in the Department of Agriculture, in testimony before congressional committees and in their various publications, point out that as early as 1962—only 7 years from now—a balance of production and consumption could be reached. This was mentioned by Mr. Davis, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in the same speech to which I referred a few moments ago.

It is my conclusion, based on these facts, that an increase in per capita consumption or more severe drought could bring the date of balance by 1958 or 1959.

Where does that leave us? It leaves us with the problem of finding more farmland, increasing the yields of present farms, and easing the effect of drought. Strangely, no one has an adequate answer for any of these alternatives, although partial answers can be found for each.

Where are we going to find new farmlands? Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, testifying before the agricultural subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, said:

If we were to consume 156 pounds of red meat, which was the consumption in 1954, it would require in 1962 some 35 million acres more land to grow feed than was used in 1953.

These figures are for the production of meat only, acres for pasture and grazing, as well as more acres in feed grains.

I have said that lands available for agriculture are diminishing, and I told where I got the figures. Is there any land not being used at present which could be put into cultivation? On page 17 of a study, *How Can America Best Provide Food and Fiber for Its Future Population*, Hon. John P. Saylor quotes the Department of Agriculture as follows:

There is an estimated 50 million acres of wet land suitable for agriculture, once it has been properly drained (and) * * * an estimated 20 million acres * * * that could be brought into production.

If we need 35 million acres by 1962, as the statements I have read indicate, we shall have to look to these unclaimed lands—and look soon. We shall have to drain them, get them into production, and look around for still more lands.

I know where about 600,000 acres of potential farmlands are now awaiting the plow. They are in the upper Colorado River Basin. Compared with the 35 million acres we need, this acreage is a very small drop in a very large bucket. But when every additional acre becomes important, we must develop land in any quantity, large or small.

Some persons assert that farm yields have increased in the past to meet increased food demands and that it is likely that yields will be expanded in the future. This probably is true—up to a point. Mr. Webb, whom I quoted earlier, seems to believe that there is a limit on how much can be wrung from a given plot of earth. We got all the speed we could out of propeller-type aircraft and had to turn to jets for more speed. Perhaps there is just so much speed in an acre of farmland.

Let us do something about the drought if we can. Shortage of water affects the yield per acre, so this subject is tied closely with farm yields. Mark Twain said there was not much we could do about the weather. His observation still holds water, if I may use such an expression. We cannot do much about how much snow falls in the winter, or have much choice as to where it falls. But we can make better use of certain moisture we now have. Not only can we do this, but we can do it in a way which will answer, in a small way, each of the problems I have mentioned—finding new land, increasing farm yields, and easing the drought situation.

I refer, of course, to reclamation. I feel very strongly about this subject—the development through reclamation of currently arid and idle farmlands of the West. It appears foolish in the extreme for a nation facing agricultural shortages to sit idly on a stream bank while one of the means of meeting a shortage flows unhindered into the sea.

Senators know that I am referring to the upper Colorado River Basin and the water which accumulates as snow on the mountain peaks of the upper basin and flows, unused, past potentially valuable agricultural lands by the millions of acre-feet every year.

Some of this water has been put to use. It generates abundant and cheap electric power and has created one of the world's agricultural marvels. This use is in the lower basin—in California, the Golden State. Everyone has prospered, including United States citizens living on the eastern seaboard who manufacture products which prosperous California farmers consume. But there is much of the Colorado River water still unused by the States to which it belongs by law.

It has been suggested that if more land is brought into production by the use of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin, it will increase our stock of surplus commodities. Few suggestions

have ever been made so foolishly. For one thing, the total new farm acreage contemplated in the completed upper Colorado project is somewhat less than 600,000 acres. As I said a moment ago, this is a very small drop in a very large bucket compared with the Agriculture Department estimate that we shall need 35 million acres of new land by 1962.

Even if every one of the proposed upper Colorado projects could be undertaken tomorrow and completed without delays of any kind, it would be 27 years before the full acreage would be in production. These figures come from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Why be concerned about so few acres? Because our population is expanding and we shall need every acre we can get. Furthermore, the people will have to find more than food. They must find work in order to live.

The power generated by the upper Colorado projects could create a vast inland empire, based on the virtually unlimited mineral, timber and agricultural resources of the upper basin.

It appears a reasonable guess, in my opinion, that not too many years will pass before Americans living in overcrowded areas will be looking around for somewhere to go. They may be emigrating to the very lands now under discussion, but presently incapable of accepting them.

I am hoping, in this discussion, to make a case for full development of the upper Colorado River basin based on agricultural necessities. There are other reasons why the project should be authorized, and they have been eloquently enumerated. They fit into the picture and help carry the load. If the project were designed for agriculture alone, it would be too costly to undertake. But since one of its benefits is agriculture, I believe I should point out how great the benefits really are.

So let us take another look at what we like to call "unbalanced agricultural production," or surpluses. This is one of the least understood problems now facing the United States, although the effect of this production has been the accumulation by the Federal Government of more than \$7 billion in stored, price-supported agricultural products.

Of all our price-supported stored crops, the one of major concern is wheat. Cotton and rice are beginning to become problems, but the economists do not anticipate their getting as out of hand as wheat has.

According to the most recent complete figures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Government has on hand approximately 702 million bushels of wheat, valued at \$1.9 billion. This includes 500 million bushels, worth approximately \$1.3 billion, which has been declared as a set-aside commodity by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Agriculture Act of 1954. If we deduct that amount from the supply owned by the CCC, which certainly was the intent of Congress, we have adjusted Government stocks of about 202 million bushels valued at about \$534 million.

While the 1954 act has done much to eliminate a depressing effect upon the

market, it has done little to reduce the annual carryover of wheat. Unless some of the marginal acres are taken out of wheat production and diverted to some other use such as pasture, the wheat problem will be with us for several years in spite of the continued upsurge in population.

A billion dollars worth of wheat sounds impressive, but wheat cannot be measured in dollars alone, due to the nature of the market and varying weather conditions. So let us measure the stock of wheat on hand in terms of annual supply.

According to the Department of Agriculture, we have enough wheat on hand to meet all our demands, both domestic and foreign, for 1 year. Does that sound impressive? Does that meet the growing demands of our population 5 years from now? Senators know how quickly that grain would vanish if we were to experience another drought as ruinous as that of the thirties.

As for our other price-supported crops, the supply, while it cannot be classified as short, certainly could not be considered in overabundance. In fact, we have only a 3-month supply of stored feed grains. This is serious, when you consider the dust bowl conditions in Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

On April 18, 1955, Life magazine published a very interesting article entitled "A Stormy Start for Farm Year." Picture after picture is shown of the effects of wind blowing in the Western States. It is an article which all should read because of its great significance.

Fairfield Osborn has published a book called *The Limits of the Earth*. The Conservation Foundation has circulated a great many copies of it. In that book he said, at page 77:

The episode in the spring of year 1935, when the sun was darkened from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic by vast clouds of soil particles borne from the denuded grasslands of the Western States, jolted our people into action and gave birth to a conservation movement that is now well begun, though as yet far from adequate. We may hear dimly, like a navigator at sea, the low and distant warning from another vessel, but we persuade ourselves that she is horizon-distant and bearing another course. There are as yet no scarlet flashes on our roadway to the future, and should these appear we would assure ourselves the road is broad and the accident somebody else's.

To be sure, scarlet flashes have appeared on the roadway within the past few months. The New York Times printed a special article, written at Denver, entitled "Dust Bowl Looms in a Four-State Area. Only if Rain or Snow Falls in Next Few Days Can Blow Be Averted."

Mr. President, I flew to my home in New Mexico during the Easter recess. When we left Kansas City and had reached a flying altitude of some 16,000 feet, and were flying over western Kansas, the dust was all around the airplane. It was 16,000 feet in the air, Mr. President. The dust stayed with us across all of New Mexico. We dropped down over the Sandia Mountains into Albuquerque, but we were not able to land at the airport there. Occasionally we could see

a little strip of runway, and a small white stripe on a highway, but, although the airplane made three or four attempts to land, it could not land and had to go on to Phoenix. When I wanted to return to Washington, the airplane in which I was to be a passenger could not reach the ground because of the mountain of dirt which was steadily floating through the atmosphere.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator well knows, I am very much interested in the development of all the land of our country and, as he has suggested, in getting more of it under cultivation. I feel that sooner or later—and perhaps the day is not far off—there will not be in this country enough land producing agricultural products.

I notice at page 15 of the committee report that the estimated total cost of the projects contemplated by the bill is \$1,658,460,000. Does that include the cost of building canals, of reclaiming land, and of the various processes preparatory to the irrigation of the land?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that it does not include the cost of putting the water on the land of the individual farmer. It includes the construction of dams. It includes the construction of the high-line canals. It takes care of the construction of the headgates and other diversionary apparatus, and it carries the water to the farmer's land.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the farmer can then use the water. It is brought to his land.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from New Mexico any estimate of what the cost will be? I have reference to some of the projects mentioned in the report. For instance, at Fruitland Mesa, according to the report at page 11, there would be water for 7,700 acres of presently irrigated land, with a potential of 11,700 additional acres. How will the cost, so far as that additional land is concerned, be financed? Would it be necessary for Congress to appropriate funds in order to reclaim that land, or to build canals or to help construct facilities to carry the water, not only to the farmer, but onto the land?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it has not been necessary on reclamation projects to go that far. If the water is available at the edge of the land, the farmer has always been able to obtain financing to carry it onto his land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that financing done through commercial channels?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is generally done through the Farm Credit Administration. Sometimes it is done by the individual farmers themselves; they are able to borrow money from relatives or friends.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will the repayment of the cost of bringing the water to the farmer be made? Will it be made in the same way as now provided by law?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; in the same way as now provided by law, with the

exception that a basin fund would be set up, and receipts from the power projects, after the power projects are paid off, would be utilized to take care of the costs which are beyond the ability of the farmer himself to finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the present law, as I understand, the farmer pays whatever assessment is made on a per acre basis over a period of 30 or 40 years, without interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That principle will apply?

Mr. ANDERSON. That principle will apply to this project.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator has the figure, what percentage of the entire cost of this project will be repaid through the development of electric power? In other words, has the Senator separated the cost of developing electricity from the cost of bringing the stored water to the farm?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am afraid that my answer will be a little unsatisfactory to the Senator, but I shall try to give it in this way: We cannot calculate that figure exactly, because we do not know what projects Congress will finally approve. Under the pending bill, certainly, we would proceed with the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, which involves a cost of approximately \$420 million. We would then proceed with the construction of the next dam, the one at Echo Park, which would involve an expenditure of approximately \$176 million. We would then build the small dams, which run to approximately \$700 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as the larger dams are concerned, most of their cost will be amortized through the sale of electric current; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Perhaps I should have had the figures available, except they vary so much, because we do not know what is going to be built in the final analysis.

We have provided for some Colorado projects, but we do not know how many will be found to be feasible. About 80 percent or perhaps as much as 85 percent of the cost will be paid eventually by the electricity users, and only about 15 percent by the irrigators themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us what is the maximum amount of money that could be spent under this bill per acre to irrigate land?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no maximum figure set up. However, I believe that the largest sum runs in the neighborhood of \$1,000, possibly \$1,200, an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator believe that that is quite a large sum for the Government to expend in order to develop land? It strikes me that there should be some kind of limitation placed on the amount that can be spent per acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator's question is, What would be the largest sum? I would say that at one time I leveled 180 acres of ground on my farm. The total leveling operation cost \$21,000. I could say that the average cost was \$120 per acre for the leveling. However, I spent \$2,600 to level 1 acre. I undertook to take away some ground, and when the

operation was finished, it proved to be very expensive. There will be certain expensive operations in connection with this project, but they will all fit into the general pattern.

On the La Barge project, the average cost per acre is \$210. On the Seeds-kadee project, the average cost is \$383. On the Lyman project the average cost is \$260, and so on. The highest average cost would be at central Utah, where it would be \$794.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the average cost?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That means that some costs may be as high as \$1,200 or \$1,500 an acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. All the land does not lie exactly in the same way. It is not all flat. In some areas there is hilly land, and in those areas the cost will run relatively high.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the cost be prorated to the farmers in proportion to the average cost in a particular area?

Mr. ANDERSON. Within a specific project; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, it would be possible for a farmer to acquire a tract of land that may have cost \$1,200, but on which the average cost to him would be only \$700?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. In the instance I mentioned I acquired 1,700 acres of land. An average value per acre was fixed for the entire project, although my land had been in a state of cultivation for more than 250 years and did not require one piece of leveling equipment on it. However, I paid the same rate as the man whose land was as hilly as any land could be. Once a man goes into an irrigation project, he becomes a participant and partner in the entire project. It takes the contribution of all in order to make the project complete.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sum derived from the sale of electric current will be used exclusively to repay the debt until when?

Mr. ANDERSON. Until every dollar of it is repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, every dime collected will be applied to the repayment of whatever sum is necessary to pay for the project, and thereafter, as I understand the Senator, it will be used to relieve the farmers where the cost may be excessive?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Senator has stated it exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, feed and forage crops are in short supply. Livestock growers in these drought-stricken States have been forced to reduce their herds. In many instances foundation herds have been liquidated entirely. With per capita consumption of red meat increasing steadily and herds being reduced due to drought conditions, we might already be facing a shortage of red meat.

It is interesting to note that since 1951 the consumption of red and poultry meat has reached record highs of about 180 pounds per person. Of this, we eat about 80 pounds of beef—an increase of near-

ly 24 pounds per person during the past 3 years. Total red meat consumption in 1954 was 154 pounds per person—a 12 pound increase since 1950. This figure was estimated at 156 but has been revised to a more accurate 154 pounds. I wanted to be accurate and submitted a draft of what I was to say to the Department of Agriculture for a careful check. Here is what the Agriculture Department has to say about the consumption of meat:

In checking the draft of the speech it should be noted that a 1954 per capita consumption of red meat of 156 pounds was used. This, of course, was the latest figure available at the time Dr. Shaw's testimony was prepared. The latest revision indicates a per capita consumption of red meat of 154 pounds in 1954. In view of the complications that would arise with respect to estimated acres needed for feed grains, hay, and pasture by 1962, it is recommended that the 156-pound figure be retained.

This means that within 7 years, as I have said, we will need an additional 35 million acres of land or its equivalent in increased yields per acre. Then the question arises: "Will we be able to put that much new land into production and, if not, will we be able to increase our yields to meet this increased demand?"

During the past 15 years cropland and available pasture and range lands, combined, have decreased slightly. During the 10-year period ended in 1950, more than 13 million acres of this land went out of production—swallowed up by expanding cities, new highways, parks, reservoirs, game refuges, military reservations, airports, and erosion.

But let us get back to the red meat consumption and our needs 7 years from now. I have said we will need an additional 35 million acres of land for feed growing purposes.

It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that we could divert 17 million acres which were planted to wheat and cotton in 1953 to feed and still produce enough wheat and cotton to meet our anticipated demands for wheat. However, we will need an additional 35 million acres, and subtracting 17 million acres from this would still leave a deficit of 18 million acres. The surplus of 17 million acres which would be diverted from wheat and cotton allows for 5 million more acres in wheat and cotton in 1962 than was actually grown in 1954 and would allow for 14 million acres more wheat and cotton than is provided in the 1955 allotments.

In other words, economic conditions could be such that the farmer would be forced, or at least encouraged, to raise more feed grains and reduce his acreage in wheat and cotton.

The shifting of land into forage to meet livestock demands can only be made by the farmers if it is profitable to them. Certainly they would not make the change if it were to mean a financial loss or increased work with the same return and neither could it be expected of them.

Even assuming that the farmers will make this change, we would still have a deficit of 18 million acres. We can look at this in two different ways: One, it would tend to absorb any increase in acre yields between now and 1962, or

two, if the acre yields were not increased substantially, it would reduce the period required to reach a balanced production.

The history of increasing crop yields per acre shows that there is a tremendous lag in transferring the gains made in the laboratory to the fields and that the production reached in the lab under ideal conditions is never attained in the field.

I am reminded of the story of the farmer who did not attend the extension meeting, and when he was asked why he did not go, because there he would learn how to farm better, he said, "Well, I do not farm as well as I know how, now."

The Connecticut egg-laying contest is an excellent example which shows how much of a lag there is in transferring gains in the laboratory to the field.

In 1920, the average of the hens in this contest layed about 160 eggs—or, about 70 eggs more than the United States average. By 1930 the contest average jumped to 210 eggs, but the United States average increased by only 5 eggs during the same 10-year period. In 1936, the contest hens reached what appears to be very close to maximum production—about 235 eggs. Since then, the average production of the contest hens has dropped as low as 200, but in 1950 it reached the 235 average again. It must be remembered that hens entered in this contest are the best available and that the owners were taking full advantage of the new information about as rapidly as they possibly could. Their primary interest is to break records no matter what the cost of production would be.

Now let us take a look at the United States average egg production per laying hen and see what it has done during the same period. In 1920 it was 90 eggs per year. Taking the following consecutive 10-year periods, it was 95, 105, and 140. In other words, by 1950 the United States average had not reached the 1920 average of the hens in the Connecticut contest. Granted, the average United States production is on the upswing, but research has done little to increase production in the laboratory.

A similar situation exists in corn production. In Iowa, the number one corn-producing State, acre yields increased only 2½ bushels from 1870 until 1937. Then, from 1937 to 1944, yields increased 15 bushels per acre. We are now in a leveling-off period.

The Iowa average began to increase in 1935, but the United States average did not show appreciable increases until the late forties.

In view of these statistics, it would appear that acre yields will not increase to the extent necessary to meet our coming food demands.

By 1975, with a projected population of about 200 million—if we take the lowest Census Bureau estimate—we will need at least an additional 100 million acres of cropland. Again, this much new land is not available. From the birth of our Nation until the first decade of the 20th century, we have always been able to expand westward to fill the needs of our increase in population. Now we have literally reached the Pacific.

From 1880 until 1920 the number of acres in cropland increased at an accelerated pace. We had 188 million acres of land in crops in 1880 with an additional 935 million available pasture and range. Ten years later we added 60 million acres to our cropland total—43 million of which came from pasture and range land. By the turn of the century, 71 million more acres were added—about 7.1 million more acres were added—about 7.1 million per year.

Again the biggest share of this land came from the plowing up of former pasture and range land, plowing up these acres in defiance of sound conservation practices.

Mr. President, I do not speak of this theoretically. In 1934 or 1935 I was a representative of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. I drove to a small community and loaded the people of that community into boxcars and moved them into the Rio Grande Valley where they had a chance to farm, because drought had taken away their opportunity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator remember seeing any irrigated area which had been farmed for a number of years that ever became a dust bowl?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. That is a sight which fortunately I have never seen. Perhaps I would be even more enthusiastic about this project if I had ever seen such a thing, but irrigated areas do not blow. I remind the Senator that we have developed in one of the eastern counties of New Mexico—Curry County—some pumping projects. They were in the very heart of the dust area at one time, but we can go through that area today and see how water has tied down the soil, reducing the blowing, although nonirrigated acres nearby are blowing as badly as in the past.

Across the Texas line from Curry County there are a number of farms which are irrigated by wells, and the entire county looks like paradise. Just below this county in Texas, where they have depended upon dry farming and do not have irrigation, the dust is blowing.

I thank the Senator from Utah for reminding me of the fact that with irrigation duststorms do not occur.

Mr. WATKINS. That is my belief. The soil is firmed down by plant growth, and the moist soil will not blow as it does in some other sections of the so-called dust bowl areas which we are constantly called upon to help. In such areas, one of the best things to do would be to get water on the land, and then the soil would not blow away.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. There are sections in western Kansas which possibly could be irrigated. If irrigation comes to those areas we will not see the dust blowing as it has been doing in the past few weeks.

While the United States was adding 7.1 million acres per year to the cropland before 1900, pasture and range land was being reduced at the annual rate of 6.1 million acres. The difference in

range and pasture being put into cropland and the total acres in cropland was made up from clearing new land for crops.

Between 1900 and 1920, 83 million acres were added to our productive cropland, most of which again came from pasture and range. Although some tractors were in use by 1920, 90 million acres were being used to produce feed for horses and mules. We are now using only about 14 million acres for this purpose. So we gained 76 million acres there, but that day has ended.

For 60 years from 1880, the pendulum swung out, taking acres from pasture and range and converting them into cropland. Since 1940, the pendulum has begun to swing back. Land experts and economists see an increasing number of acres being converted to improved pasture and range with a proportionately increasing number of acres going into feed and forage crops.

I believe that a great saving can be made if these drought areas are protected.

The overall land area of the United States includes mountains and deserts which cannot be used for cropland. Of course, about 17 million additional acres can be placed into production through irrigation, but this is not anticipated within the next 50 years. Assuming that this much is placed under irrigation, it would still not be enough to meet the demands of our population 20 years from now, although it would be a needed supplement.

Assuming that the new land is placed under irrigation, we will lose at least that much land in the next 25 years through erosion, urban growth, airports, and highways. The land taken out of production for these reasons frequently is good farmland. Often we fail to realize the very large area of land taken out of production by highways.

For example, most of us see only the tremendous benefits to travel which will come when the Pennsylvania Turnpike is extended from Canton, Ohio, to Chicago. Others say it will be wonderful when we have a four-lane highway spanning the United States. I agree wholeheartedly—the roads will be excellent.

However, the turnpike extension from Canton to Chicago will take between 80,000 to 100,000 acres of excellent cropland out of production. Anyone familiar with the topography of that area knows what excellent farmland will be lost. It is not difficult, therefore, to visualize the number of acres which will be taken out of production by the President's proposed highway plan which calls for several thousand miles of four-lane highways. Highways and airports have one thing in common—airports need flat terrain and frequently it is excellent farmland; highways usually follow the flattest line and this too is often excellent farmland.

At present we are using about four-fifths of our land area for agricultural purposes—this includes pasture, range forest and woodland. Only 409 million acres, or about a fifth of all our land area, is used for cropland purposes. In

1954 crops from only 345 million acres were actually being harvested.

But a more important observation is that the number of crop acres per person has declined. In 1920 it was 3.8 acres per person and by 1950 it had dwindled to 2.7 acres. Estimates for 1954 have it at 2.5 acres per person.

Of course, increased yields per acre have made it possible for us to meet the demands of our population and some persons believe that we will continue to be able to meet these demands by increasing our yields. Research has done much to increase our yields, but nearly all of the increase was experienced during the 1939-49 period. In the years before 1936, total farm production was neither very much above nor very much below the 1935-39 average except for the drought period.

After 1939, total production started a fast climb, hitting its peak in 1953. Many persons believe these production records were attained only because we were on a war economy and practically everyone took advantage of the modern farm methods which were made available by American ingenuity and know-how. Everyone also was doing what he could for the war effort and this aided production.

It must be remembered that since 1940, at the direct request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States—during which time we were trying virtually to feed the world and win World War II—farm output has been at a greater rate of increase than the increase in population. One of the factors behind this increased farm output was the favorable weather which prevailed. In weather, we never had it so good.

Let us assume that we will continue for the next 20 years on a strictly peacetime economy. We will have to increase our yields more than a fifth above the 1950 average. This increase makes allowances for some additional cropland coming into food production for the first time and relies partly on placing at least 6 million more acres of land under irrigation. It might be well to point out that the 6 million figure is considerably more than all of the land which has been brought under irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation during the 52 years of its existence.

Will we be able to increase our yields per acre by the minimum 20 percent that will be required? In research and any other field there is a ceiling on how far we can go. Where that ceiling is, I am quite certain no one knows, but I do believe a parallel can be drawn to the track stars of our time even though they are completely unrelated fields.

For years, the 4-minute mile was the dream of many. The first time our modern day runners ran the mile, it probably took 5 or 6 minutes. As they trained, they were quick to reduce their time by the ten's of seconds. Yet, as they approached the dream mile the time it took to run the mile would be reduced just by a second or two or even by tenths of a second. I cannot help but believe that this is what will happen to agriculture. In improving anything, the first

gains are the most pronounced—after that, they become less and less impressive and more difficult to attain.

There has been a rather parallel increase of farm output with population since 1880—the first year records were kept. Principal factors, landwise and researchwise, behind the increased output between 1910 and 1930, were bringing in more acres for agricultural production and the release of millions of acres from growing of feed for horses and mules.

The first 6 years of the thirties saw a pronounced decrease in farm output due to the drought. It is interesting to note that crop yields per acre have remained rather static since 1948 and that the increase in overall farm output has been due, primarily, to increased output per livestock unit.

Further evidence of this is the amount of carryover of major farm commodities. Each year this has become less. In 1953, for example, the excess of farm output over population requirements was about 6 percent. In 1954 it was less than 6 percent and estimates for the current year are even lower. The Agriculture Department says the rate of excess build-up is leveling off.

I need not remind my colleagues that America has become a great Nation because we have had abundance. We are known the world over as the land of plenty. Not only have we had an abundance of crops, but we have also had an abundance of people who were not afraid to look to the future and people who continually are looking for ways to do things easier and better. Many nations have become weak with decreasing standards of living because they lacked the ability to produce enough to meet the food needs of their people. They lacked leaders with enough insight to prepare their country to meet the ever-increasing demands. I hope we who are entrusted with this great responsibility, will not lose sight of preparing for our future growth and development.

Our country is growing in many ways—in people, in resources, in ingenuity, in standard of living and in energy which makes progress possible. It does not take much vision to see the great expansion which is ahead.

I have been discussing various crops which are presently in overproduction and have predicted that we could reach a balance in their production by 1962.

Now let us look at a few specialty crops—crops without which the American diet would be incomplete—fresh vegetables, fruits, and others which once were seasonal crops but now find their way to the basic American table the year around.

The American standard of living demands more and more of these specialty crops.

Dieticians stress the importance of having these foods in our daily meals. A large share of these crops is produced through irrigation and reclamation. We are producing enough to meet our present demands, but only at the present rate of consumption. Here, again, we must increase production and this can be done in part by bringing new land under irrigation.

To illustrate how much we depend upon irrigation and reclamation for these specialty crops, I have had a table prepared showing the total production of these specialty crops in the United States and the amount raised under irrigation in the 17 Western States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table, entitled "Crop Production," printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Crop production

Year	Crop	Total for United States (million pounds)	17 Western States	
			Total (million pounds)	Percentage
1954	Asparagus.....	307	189	62
1954	Carrots.....	1,550	1,108	72
1954	Celery.....	1,496	837	56
1954	Lettuce.....	2,834	2,527	89
1954	Peas.....	850	329	39
1952	Olives.....	114	114	100
1954	Tomatoes.....	7,390	3,766	51
1952	Apricots.....	354	354	100
1954	Cantaloupes.....	1,322	1,101	83
1954	Cherries (sweet)....	200	170	85
1952	Grapes.....	6,347	6,028	95
1952	Plums.....	122	106	87
1954	Strawberries.....	427	265	62

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it must be remembered that only through the year-round growing season of the irrigated Southwest are most of these crops made available to the rest of the country during the late fall, winter and early spring seasons. In summing up the picture, there are certain facts which we must recognize.

First. We have approximately 1,904,000,000 acres land area of which about four-fifths is being used for agricultural purposes. A fifth of this is actually used for cropland.

Second. We are losing about 1.4 million acres per year through use of land for highways, airports, reservoirs, military reservations and expanding cities and erosion. Population increase could bring agriculture production in balance if production is adjusted to demand.

Third. We need, with the diet that we currently use, an equivalent of production from an additional 6 to 7.5 million acres each year.

Fourth. We need, by 1975, at least 20 to 30 million acres of new cropland.

Fifth. Present crop yields per acre will have to be increased at least 20 percent during the next 7 to 10 years. This assumes we will place at least 6 million additional acres under irrigation.

Sixth. A drought of 1 year's duration with as ruinous effect as experienced in the 1930's would almost deplete our present supply of stored crops.

Seventh. Population of the United States is now 162 million, increasing nearly 3 million per year.

Eighth. For 1975 the population projection now considered as the most reasonable is about 207 million persons. Five years ago 190 million was considered the most likely projection for 1975.

I have discussed what we can expect in 1962 so far as our agricultural supplies are concerned and brushed only lightly

on what we can conservatively foresee by 1975.

Many persons believe this work can be done quickly and that the participating upper Colorado irrigation projects will be planted at once. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Projected Acreages and Completion Times for S. 500 Projects—Irrigation."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projected acreages and completion times for S. 500 projects (irrigation)

	Years	Acres
1. Central Utah.....	26	28,540
2. Emory County.....	9	3,630
3. Florida.....	9	6,300
4. Hammond.....	10	3,670
5. La Barge.....	11	7,970
6. Lyman.....	10	-----
7. Paonia.....	8	2,210
8. Pine River extension.....	13	15,150
9. Seedskadee.....	17	60,720
10. Silt.....	8	-----
11. Smith Fork.....	8	2,270
12. Gooseberry.....	9	-----
13. Navaho.....	27	137,250
14. San Juan Chama.....	15	-----
15. Savery Pot Hook.....	10	18,380
16. Dolores.....	12	35,450
17. Sublette.....	14	60,000
18. Fruit Growers Dam extension.....	6	1,850
19. Bostwick Park.....	7	1,040
20. Dallas Creek.....	10	15,750
21. East River.....	3	1,780
22. Fruitland Mesa.....	8	11,700
23. Grand Mesa.....	11	11,070
24. Ohio Creek.....	7	6,200
25. Tomichi.....	8	12,180
26. Battlement Mesa.....	7	6,780
27. Bluestone.....	6	8,660
28. Eagle Divide.....	6	8,990
29. Parshall.....	8	24,410
30. Rabbit Ear.....	6	13,955
31. Troublesome.....	7	8,990
32. West Divide.....	14	40,500
33. Woody Creek.....	4	645

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, how does the upper Colorado Basin fit into this picture?

Let us consider what has been proposed. We have the initial storage projects. They will not add an acre of farmland. They will generate power, control the river flow, and provide downstream irrigation.

Next come the 12 participating projects. They will take as long as 26 years to complete.

The total for these 12 starting projects comes to 130,660 new acres—little more than 5,000 acres per year. We said a while ago that we would be needing more than a million acres a year. This is hardly adding to the surplus, is it?

Most of the acreage would come into cultivation toward the end of the 26 years, not at an average of 5,000 acres a year, due to construction requirements.

But let us say that every one of the projects could be started tomorrow and that every one of the contemplated acres would be in production at the end of 27 years, the length of time required to complete the biggest project—the Navaho project.

What would the increased farm output amount to?

At my request, the Agriculture Department this week made a projection based on a possible utilization of 270,000 acres, the new acreage planned under the upper Colorado bill. This figure was

used because it represents the earliest acreage to be developed.

Here is what the Department found—About 50,000 acres would be devoted to raising oats; 50,000 acres would be planted to barley; 105,000 acres to alfalfa hay, and 65,000 acres to irrigated pasture.

Converted to approximately 670 million feed units, this acreage would support annual production of approximately 60 million pounds liveweight of cattle and calves, or about 0.1 percent of our estimated requirements for cattle and calf production in the next 25 to 50 years.

Is this a threat to agriculture? An addition to surpluses?

Agriculturally, the upper Colorado River project will make very little difference in the total United States picture.

But when the acreage is fitted into the demands of the region, it becomes more significant, supplying a livelihood and sustenance to farmers in an area now lying unused while the water which could turn it into paradise flows unhindered into the sea.

From a power standpoint the upper Colorado project has perhaps even wider significance. Power could bring industry to these high, dry tablelands, exploiting the virtually untapped mineral and timber resources of the region.

There are many facets to the upper Colorado Basin story. Each of them has fabulous promise if allowed to develop. Each hinges, at least to some extent, on the other.

Therefore, the overall project should be undertaken and work should be started as early as possible.

It has been said that we are asking for huge sums of money, to be taken in one lump from the United States Treasury. This is not so.

The amounts we are asking will be spent over a period of 1 to 30 years. The smallest amounts to be spent will come first, with largest amounts coming between 5 and 10 years.

To show just what is being asked, I have prepared a short listing of the amounts needed and when they will be needed. As will be seen, they hardly can be considered a threat to the budget.

I desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the amount of money which would be asked, year by year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1956.....	\$5,000,000
1957.....	30,000,000
1958.....	48,000,000
1959.....	91,000,000
1960.....	118,000,000
1961.....	134,000,000
1962.....	127,000,000
1963.....	133,000,000
1964.....	117,000,000
1965.....	91,000,000
1966.....	59,000,000
1967.....	47,000,000
1968.....	35,000,000
1969.....	21,000,000
1970.....	9,000,000
1971.....	5,000,000
1972.....	3,000,000
1973.....	9,000,000
1974.....	7,000,000
1975.....	1,000,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, now I wish to state my conclusions, as follows:

First. Surpluses will end.

Second. We need to start now to meet expected food shortages.

Third. The upper Colorado Basin is more than a reclamation project. It can supply jobs, food, and wealth.

Fourth. It will mean the creation of an empire to be built from materials at hand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the clerk's desk a proposed unanimous-consent request for an order limiting debate, which I should like to have stated. It is offered in behalf of the majority and the minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent request.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or someone designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, who in turn has consulted with the ranking minority Members. I have also talked to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Senators interested in the pending legislation. The proposed agreement seems to be agreeable to those concerned, and it will permit us to make plans for the remainder of the afternoon. Following the morning hour on tomorrow, the time limitation would start to run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request? Without objection—

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not hear the proposal from the beginning. I wonder if I might look at it for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, with respect to the limitation of debate on amendments, I suggest that the limitation should be 2 hours to a side, because I understand there will be only one principal amendment, and that will require some discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall have possibly three amendments to offer tomorrow. I am quite content with the half hour that would be allotted to those of us who would propose the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to remind Senators that we have the remainder of today to discuss the bill. Any Senators who desire to do so may offer amendments today.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent requested is agreed to.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the very able discussion by the Senate from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] with regard to his views on the important issue before the Senate. In general I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. He and I part company on only one phase of the project involved. The upper Colorado project calls for 6 storage units, 12 participating units, and 21 projects which are subject to further authorization.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM ENDANGERED

One of the storage projects, Mr. President, would be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument. It would constitute a most dangerous precedent in that it would lead to the breaching by a dam of our national park system for the first time in its history. If that happens, the entire national park system would be exposed to commercial development.

The theory of our national park system is that the beauty, the grandeur—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will suspend until Senators take their seats and attendants retire to the rear of the room.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Thank you, Mr. President. I gather it might be more quiet in one of the magnificent national parks to which I was referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will proceed. Let us have quiet in the Chamber.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The theory of our national park system, Mr. President, is that the grandeur, the majesty, and the scenery of the national parks shall be unimpaired. The word "unimpaired" does not mean that a park or a national monument shall be inundated beneath a vast reservoir. The language means precisely what it says.

Before proceeding further to discuss the Echo Park phase of the Colorado River project and what it would mean to basic recreational and scenic policy, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself in general with the statements made by the Senator from New Mexico in defense of the development of the Far West.

LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION WAS ATTACKED AS WASTEFUL

Mr. President, throughout the entire history of this country, there have been men who have disparaged the inexorable movement toward the West. This year of 1955 marks the 150th anniversary of the greatest exploration in the history of America. Exactly 150 years ago this year Meriwether Lewis and William Clark arrived at the shores of the Pacific Ocean with the American flag, and for the first time Americans had crossed this continent. Yet, even then, there were people who felt that this was a foolish undertaking. Thomas Jefferson, that illustrious President, asked the Congress for the vast sum of \$2,500 to finance this most important of explorations, which Theodore Roosevelt was to say later ranked in history with the explorations of Columbus. Yet there were Members of Congress who felt that the \$2,500 requested by Jefferson was a waste.

Indeed, after Lewis and Clark had returned, and had brought back almost the first information Americans had ever had about the Rocky Mountains, the grizzly bear, the prairie dog, the bighorn sheep, and the mountain goat, there actually were in political life men who still insisted that the expedition had been a folly, and who seriously predicted that the area through which Lewis and Clark had traveled never again would be visited in the course of American history.

Mr. President, Daniel Webster was outstanding in his service in the Congress. Yet when it was proposed that cavalry be sent to protect the pioneers who had gone into hostile Indian territory, Daniel Webster insisted that tax dollars should not be spent in protecting those who had risked their lives in a foolhardy rush into the wilderness; and he said he would not give a silver dollar for all of Oregon—meaning, not the State of Oregon, but the vast realm then known as the Oregon Country.

There also served in this Chamber, Mr. President, a man who felt that the western borders of the United States could never possibly be thrust beyond the Continental Divide. That Member of the Senate was one of the most famous of Senators; I refer to Thomas Hart Benton. On March 1, 1825, he said to the Senate:

Westward, we can speak without reserve, and the ridge of the Rocky Mountains may be named without offense as presenting a convenient, natural, and everlasting boundary. Along the bank of this ridge, the western limit of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled god, Terminus, should be raised upon its highest peak, never to be thrown down. In planting the seed of a new power on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, it should be well understood that when strong enough to take care of itself, the new government should separate from the major Empire, as the child separates from the parent at the age of manhood.

In other words, Mr. President, that very distinguished Senator, Thomas Hart Benton, believed it would be impossible to thrust the boundaries of the Nation beyond the divide formed by the Rocky Mountains, or the Shining Mountains, as they then were called; and he believed that if people were so foolish as to live

beyond that boundary, there would have to be two separate sovereign nations.

LONG VIEW NEEDED IN WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

I cite these things in support of what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has so eloquently said about the need for developing the West and about the need for challenging those who would take the short view and the narrow view regarding the West.

I cite the fact that even in the time of Jefferson there were those who felt it was unwise to spend the trivial sum of \$2,500 to send the first Americans westward to extend our sovereignty from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean. In other words, there were then in the Nation those who believed it was silly to spend \$2,500 on an expedition to increase by nearly two-thirds the size of the United States.

Mr. President, I consider it opportune to say this because this is the 150th anniversary year of that greatest of all treks westward, the Lewis and Clark exploration.

I know that the Reclamation Act of 1906, passed during the administration of a great, progressive Republican President—and would that his views still prevailed in the Republican Party—has been a vital factor in the development of our Western States, particularly the 11 States which lie westward of the Continental Divide, in the vast area which Thomas Hart Benton thought could never become a part of this sovereign nation.

Parenthetically speaking, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 2 weeks ago held hearings on the Hells Canyon Dam bill, there were present a number of persons who opposed the bill—and they were members of Theodore Roosevelt's party, I may add—and who told us that the public-power preference clause was socialistic and un-American. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the public-power preference clause first appeared in the Reclamation Act of 1906, drafted under the supervision of Theodore Roosevelt, and passed during his administration. I said of several of those witnesses that that was the first time I had ever known that the man who founded the Rough Riders and led the cavalry charge up San Juan Hill was socialistic and un-American.

Mr. President, the party of Theodore Roosevelt has traveled a long distance since Theodore Roosevelt's time; but it has not moved forward. However, the policies that Theodore Roosevelt began in the Reclamation Act of 1906 have resulted in making possible the settlement of large areas of the West, which without irrigation supported by the Federal Government never could be inhabited to any considerable extent. We need to think only of the Central Valley of California; or of the Columbia Basin, near Grand Coulee; or of the Salt River section, in Arizona; or of the Madras project in Oregon; or of the Yakima Valley; or of many other great areas which, without Federal reclamation, certainly would not be the prosperous agricultural regions they are today.

CAPITAL INVESTMENTS IN WEST JUSTIFIED

So I say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that when we point out that often it is necessary for the United States Government to make capital investments in areas of the Nation which need development, this is part of the history of our country and part of the forward march of progress of our country, and without these developments our country would not be the great, free, prosperous, and powerful nation it is today.

Mr. President, I should like to say that it is not so far-fetched a policy for the United States Government to make capital investments in reclamation projects, even though they may not seem to be sound economically when they are first undertaken. As I recall, the Government of the United States in its infinite wisdom gave the Northern Pacific Railroad some \$171 million in land grants so it could build a \$70-million railroad line to the Pacific Northwest. Perhaps that was not wise economically. Yet if those land grants had not been parceled out in that way, the development of the Northwest could have been retarded from 30 to 60 years, because the railroad might not have been put through during the time in which it actually came. I believe the Northern Pacific arrived on Puget Sound in 1884 or 1885.

RIVERS AND HARBORS WERE DEVELOPED BY
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Other parts of the country, Mr. President, have benefited by vast investments, and investments which have not returned a direct dividend, although they certainly have been justified in terms of the progress and prosperity they have made possible for the Nation as a whole. In that connection, let us consider the millions, if not the billions, of dollars which have been spent on the Mississippi River to develop navigation with locks and levees. Let us also consider the funds which have been invested in improving the waterways on the Great Lakes and the funds which have been invested to make New York Harbor the greatest harbor in North America, and perhaps the greatest harbor in all the world. Those funds have come from the Federal Government. They have been spent in dredging for locks, for canals, and so forth. No one has suggested that those expenditures were not wise, although relatively little of that money has been returned directly to the Treasury.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the vast areas of the intermountain West and of the West along the Pacific seaboard are entitled to Federal support in the form of reclamation and irrigation.

I say this as a matter of preface, because I support the bill. I believe that the upper Colorado storage project, as a whole, is justified. I feel that the intermountain region, which certainly has lagged behind the rest of the country in population with respect to area, is entitled to a capital investment which will enable it to support a far larger agricultural economy.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that the upper Colorado project, how-

ever justified it may be, warrants the establishment of a precedent which could lead, through all the years to come, to the impairment, if not the actual destruction, of one of the great institutions of America; namely, our national park system.

At this point in my remarks I should like to associate myself with a very brief statement of policy drawn up at an emergency meeting in November 1954 by nearly all the leading conservation and outdoor groups of America, called together by the National Parks Association. This statement makes it very clear that these conservation groups are not opposed to the upper Colorado storage project in its entirety, but they do oppose the Echo Park phase of that project, which would lead to the flooding out of the Dinosaur National Monument, which is an integral part of the United States national park system.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement by leading conservation groups of America, representing people in all 48 States—indeed, I may say, in perhaps every county of the United States, including those in the upper Colorado area. This statement makes it clear that the Echo Park project would breach our national parks system.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being enjoyed and supported by millions of people. The conservationists represent the public interest in the preservation of these areas. That is what brings us together in this crisis.

2. We are opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would flood any portion of any national park or monument.

3. We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system. We point out that the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been demonstrated. It has only been asserted. We also point out that the alternatives to Echo Park Dam have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proved inferior.

4. We invite all citizens to join with us to make sure that areas set aside for preservation in the national park system are not needlessly invaded or destroyed.

Signed by the American Museum of Natural History, the American Nature Association, the American Planning and Civic Association, the Conservation Department, Yale University, the Conservation Foundation, the Council of Conservationists, the Dartmouth Outdoor Club, the Emergency Conservation Committee, the Garden Club of America, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Audubon Society, the National Conference on State Parks, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Life Conservation Society, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the North American Wildlife Foundation, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think we of the Pacific Northwest who are supporting the upper Colorado project really are showing a great deal of forbearance. I should like to point out that this national administration has taken an attitude with respect to power development which I do not believe can be justified by any stretch of facts or statistics, or by any operation of logic.

THE ADMINISTRATION CONTRADICTS ITSELF

This administration has said to the people of the country, "Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River is creeping socialism, but Federal dams on the upper Colorado are just good old free enterprise, which the Federal Government ought to support."

I should like to say that the distinguished governors of Oregon and Washington, who are members of the party which is in power—perhaps I should not use the word "power" with respect to this administration, because it might be confused with hydroelectric power—members of the party which is in authority in the National Government appeared at the recent Hells Canyon hearings and denounced the proposal to construct a Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Yet the very political party which thinks it is dangerous to the future of the Republic to build a Federal dam in Hells Canyon is for constructing many dams on the upper Colorado River.

My position is consistent. I believe that the upper Colorado project should be built, with the exception of Echo Park, but I also believe that the Hells Canyon Federal project in the Pacific Northwest should be constructed.

This administration has a policy of turning over to private utilities the cream of hydroelectric power sites and leaving for public development, out of the Federal Treasury, the dregs of the power sites. Let me point out exactly the situation.

The Echo Park project would cost \$176,426,000. It would produce about 1 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

The Glen Canyon project, which is closely related, would cost about \$421 million and would produce about 3,813,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. In other words, these 2 projects together would cost nearly \$600 million, and produce about 4,830,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Hells Canyon, which this administration has shunned, would cost \$357 million and produce 5,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually.

In other words, Echo Park Dam would cost about half as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 20 percent as much power. Hells Canyon Dam power is about 2.65 times more economical than Echo Park power.

Glen Canyon Dam would cost 1.18 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 20 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is about 1.7 times more economical.

Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams together would cost 1.67 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 87 percent as much power. There-

fore Hells Canyon Dam power would be 1.9 times more economical, in respect to power production.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief table comparing the relative costs and power output of these projects.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative costs and power output

Project	Cost of project	Net annual output (millions of kilowatt-hours annually)
Echo Park.....	\$176, 426, 000	1, 017
Glen Canyon.....	421, 270, 000	3, 813
Total.....	597, 696, 000	4, 830
Hells Canyon.....	357, 000, 000	5, 504

Echo Park Dam costs about half as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produces less than 20 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is about 2.65 times more economical.

Glen Canyon Dam costs 1.18 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produces less than 70 percent as much power. Therefore Hells Canyon Dam power is about 1.7 times more economical.

Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams, together, cost 1.67 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 87 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is 1.9 times more economical.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What does this mean? This is what it means: Power from Echo Park Dam would cost around 6 mills a kilowatt-hour. Power from Hells Canyon Dam would cost between 2.1 mills and 2.6 mills. The national administration, which only a few weeks ago said that the average American citizen could not have a cut in his or her taxes because of the need for balanced budget, says, "We will finance out of the Federal Treasury the marginal, uneconomical power sites, where electricity is extremely expensive to produce, but we will give away to the private power companies the power sites where cheap power can be produced, which power would be in great demand by industry."

If the policy of this administration with respect to power sites were adopted with respect to the United States post office system, the administration would turn over to Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward—once the fight is settled at Montgomery Ward—the few profitable post offices, such as New York, Chicago, the great city of the Senator now occupying the chair [Mr. DOUGLAS], Cleveland, perhaps San Francisco, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Philadelphia, and say to them, "You operate these post offices. You can make a profit from them. We, the Government, will continue to operate the small, remote, scattered, isolated post offices. You could not make any money out of them."

ADMINISTRATION POLICY CANNOT BE MADE CONSISTENT BY ADVERTISING SLOGANS

The policy of this balance-the-budget national administration with respect to hydroelectric power is this: It says that it will use propaganda turned out by ad-

vertising agencies to convince the people that it is creeping socialism to construct a dam on the Snake River, because power on the Snake River can be sold to industry, and because such power can be produced economically, but the Government will develop the marginal sites on the upper Colorado River.

I may be very dense. I admit that I am a very new Senator, occupying seat No. 96. But no matter how dense I may be, I do not see how a Federal dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River can be creeping socialism, but a Federal dam on the upper Colorado River, particularly one which damages the national park system, can be good old Republican free enterprise. If some of the master minds of this administration can explain that to the people, I certainly will be interested in the explanation, because so far I have been unable to understand the logic of the administration's statements.

What the administration is saying to the people of the country is this: "We will build the dams on the upper Colorado, even at the risk of wrecking the national park system; but the sites in the Columbia River Basin, the finest hydroelectric power sites in North America, are too good for the United States Government. Therefore we must give them to the Idaho Power Co., or to the Washington Water Power Co., or to Pacific Power & Light Co."

Was there ever before such a policy? Power produced at Hells Canyon, and selling for about 2.5 mills, would be in demand by every great industrial and manufacturing concern which uses large amounts of power. How many manufacturing concerns want power from the upper Colorado at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour? Mr. President, if you were in the manufacturing business would you buy power at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour on the upper Colorado River when there was power available at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, or at John Day, or Bonneville on the Columbia River for 2 mills or 2.5 mills?

Of course not, because if your competitor had 2.5 mill power, you would be out of business; you could not compete.

I am not saying that we should not build some of those so-called uneconomic projects, because, as I have already stated in my opening remarks, a capital investment from the United States Treasury is just as justified in arid areas as are projects to improve navigation on the Mississippi River, for instance. However, I say that the administration now in power should not try to turn over to private industry the cream of the power sites in the country.

DOES THE PRESIDENT KNOW THE ADMINISTRATION'S POWER POLICY?

Mr. President, in that connection, I was interested recently in reading in the New York Times the text of one of the press conferences held by the President of the United States. At the conference the President cited approvingly a book called *Big Dam Foolishness*. I believe it was written by a man named Elmer Peterson. I bought the book. The general thesis of the book is that it is foolish, to use an understatement, for

the United States Government to build these big dams.

That is all right for the President to say. It is certainly the privilege of our distinguished and illustrious President to believe that the building of big dams is foolishness. However, has anyone told the President what the policy of the Government is?

The policy of the Government is that it is "big dam foolishness" when the Columbia River or the Snake River are involved, because both have excellent power sites with deep and steady flows of water, with heavy snowfall in the mountains. That is "big dam foolishness," according to the policy of the present administration.

However, on the upper Colorado, where there is infinitely less water, where it is much more expensive to produce power, through some sort of legerdemain, by some kind of wizardry of a Merlin or of a Houdini, that is not "big dam foolishness." In other words, when the President looks at the Snake River and the Columbia River, he has under his arm the book *Big Dam Foolishness*, and he quotes from the book at his press conference. However, when he looks at the upper Colorado River he puts the book away. He does not have that book with him when he looks at the upper Colorado River.

I still fail to see how hydroelectric development can be "big dam foolishness" at Hells Canyon, but not foolishness on the upper Colorado, where a Federal dam would flood out a national monument.

DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT A PART OF OUR PARK SYSTEM

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the creation of the Dinosaur National Monument. Let me say that the Dinosaur National Monument is a part of our national park system, as is every other monument. Many of our national parks today, such as the Olympic National Park or the Grand Canyon National Park, were originally national monuments before they were advanced to the status of national parks. If there is any one feature of our national life to which all Americans are devoted, it is our national park system.

I dare say that there are people in every State of the Union, including Colorado and Utah, who have expressed themselves against the proposed Echo Park Dam. I have letters from the upper Colorado area in which people ask that the Echo Park Dam be not authorized. People in every part of the Nation are pleading and praying that Congress will not, for the first time in history, authorize a commercial power development within the borders of a national park or monument.

Congress itself has been aware of this potential danger to the proper preservation of these areas in accordance with their fundamental purpose.

Less than a year following its enactment, the Congress, on March 3, 1921, amended the Federal Water Power Act to provide that thereafter no permit or other authorization should be granted

for reservoirs or other works for storage or carriage of water within the limits as then constituted of any national park or national monument without specific authority of Congress. The language of the amendment is comprehensive and absolute, and its meaning clear.

In any event, all possible doubt as to the purpose of the act would be resolved by its legislative history. In calling up the bill in the House, Representative Esch stated—*CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, 66th Congress, 3d session; volume 60, part IV, page 4204:

Mr. Speaker, the object of the bill is to modify the Federal Water Power Act so as to eliminate from its provisions national parks and monuments. When the act was originally passed we supposed we had sufficiently safeguarded national parks and monuments so that there would not be constructed therein any water power or reclamation projects. However, the President was in doubt as to whether he would sign the bill which was presented to him on the 4th day of June, the day before we adjourned. He referred the bill to the Secretaries of the Interior, War, and Agriculture. The Secretary of the Interior had great doubt as to the policy of giving to a commission control over national parks and monuments in the matter of water-power development. Senator Jones, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and Senator Walsh, of Montana, called upon the Secretary and conferred with him regarding the signing of the bill. The Secretary conferred with Senator Underwood and the majority leader, Mr. Mondell, and an understanding was reached whereby the bill was to be introduced at this session eliminating the parks and monuments from the operation of the Federal Power Act, and this bill carries out that understanding.

Similar statements were made in the Senate by Senator Jones, of Washington, and Senator Walsh, of Montana.

Since the 1921 act was, by its terms, restricted to areas embraced within national parks and national monuments on the date of the act, it was necessary, until 1935, to include in proposed legislation for establishing or extending national parks or national monuments a provision to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from granting power licenses therein. This is no longer necessary. When the Federal Water Power Act was amended by the Federal Power Act in 1935, the definition of the "reservations" to which the act was to apply was amended to exclude national parks and monuments, thus removing these areas from the authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to the issuance of power licenses, without regard to the date of their establishment. The intention of the Congress, by this amendment, to afford unlimited protection to all national parks and national monuments from encroachment of power development, is made undeniably clear by the legislative history. In the report—No. 1318, 74th Congress—of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, accompanying the bill, S. 2796, which became the Federal Power Act of 1935, it is stated, page 22:

The definition of the former term ("reservations") has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under an amendment to the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue

licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of "reservations" is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses.

The question whether the authority of the Federal Power Commission to issue power licenses could be preserved by an appropriate provision in a proclamation of the President reserving lands for national monument purposes under the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, has been considered by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. In an opinion dated December 5, 1939, he held:

Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an Executive proclamation of this character.

ECHO PARK DAM COULD BE BAD PRECEDENT

I now wish to speak about the proposal to build the dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. There are pending in various parts of the Nation, generally in the West, not fewer than 15 or 16 requests or demands that within national parks or monuments there be built dams, diversion canals, diversion tunnels, irrigation flumes, and similar undertakings. This is natural, Mr. President, because our national parks and monuments have been deliberately placed in realms of great scenic beauty. Water is a great contribution to the scenic beauty of many areas in the West. This means rivers and lakes.

For example, Yellowstone Lake is, I believe, the highest large body of water in the United States. Some irrigationists would like to get into the park and utilize the waters of that lake which can be coasted downhill in a great gravity sweep for reclaiming arid land. In my own region, the Olympic National Park encompasses the greatest rain forests left on the North American Continent. I have camped with my wife in those forests. I have not been fortunate enough to visit tropical forests, but if there are any forests which can match the denseness of the tropics and still retain the cool grandeur of evergreens, it is the groves which grow within the Olympic National Park.

Some of the largest lumber operators in the country would like to get in there. There are some of the most compelling reasons why they should. In the northwestern part of the State of Washington, which is represented in part by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who is now present on the floor, a large number of trees have been cut out. Some families are jobless. Mills have lost their log supply. If 60,000 or 70,000 acres could be trimmed from that magnificent park, many mills would have a supply of lumber for years and years to come, because the trees are the old virgin, original growth, comprising the highest quality of timber ever grown in North America. The timber was standing when Christopher Columbus landed in the New World, and it was old when the members of the Lewis and Clark expedition reached the mouth of the Columbia River.

If the timber companies could log the trees of the Olympic Park, it would assist the families who need jobs and the mill owners who want to amortize their investment. There are sound economic reasons elsewhere, as well as in the upper Colorado Basin.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has asked a question. The question was, if the Echo Park Dam is permitted to be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument, will it not open up the Olympic area for the construction of dams? The answer to the Senator's question is, emphatically, no.

The entire argument which the Senator has been making with respect to the Echo Park damsite is based upon a mistaken set of facts. The Echo Park site was withdrawn for power purposes by the full authority of the Government of the United States long before the Dinosaur National Monument was extended to include that site. As the record made at the hearings of the House and Senate, and upon this floor, clearly demonstrates, when the executive order of President Roosevelt was issued, these lands had already been set aside for the development of power. Dinosaur National Monument was created by Woodrow Wilson under the Antiquities Act, which specifically recited that although the President would be entitled to withdraw from the public domain sites of historical and scientific interest, in so withdrawing them he was compelled to withdraw the smallest area possible. So, when Woodrow Wilson created the Dinosaur National Monument by Executive order, he withdrew 80 acres.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To protect dinosaur bones.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To protect dinosaur bones. Then, in the effort to deceive the conservationists and to take land which had been set aside for power purposes, the National Park Service and its adherents sought to bring about an extension of that monument, taking over 200,000 acres of land, including power sites.

The Department of the Interior, under Harold Ickes, specifically stated that the power sites were conflicting rights which were not to be affected. The invasion was an invasion by the National Park Service of the law, in the first place, and, in the second place, an invasion of the power rights which had been previously established.

National parks are created by acts of Congress. National monuments are created by Executive orders under specific limitations. Whatever may be done with respect to a monument is by no means a precedent with respect to what may be done with a national park.

I stand with the Senator from Oregon in favor of the Hells Canyon project. I was one of the sponsors of the bill. I have spent many years in this body, and I venture to say that the national parks have not had a more persistent defender than I have been; but when the Senator from Oregon suggests that a national monument created by an Executive order

which specifically preserved existing rights would set a precedent for invading national parks, I say the facts are all against him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that if national monuments which often preceded national parks in the same location had not—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator name one?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; the Olympic National Park.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How was it created a national park?

Mr. NEUBERGER. By act of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. Was this monument, with 203,000 acres along the river, ever by act of Congress declared to be a national park? It was not.

The law authorizing national monuments provides that they must consist of the smallest acreage possible and that existing rights must be preserved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If we had not in the early days protected national monuments there would be very few national parks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to protect public-power sites just as much as the Senator from Oregon does, but the Senator is speaking of destroying power sites which the people in the upper basin need, power sites which would help Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am supporting the bulk of the power sites called for in the upper Colorado storage project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And for that I am grateful.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What I am saying is that I believe an alternative site could be found that would not result in flooding out the Dinosaur Monument. I am fully aware that a national monument is created by Executive order and that a national park is created by an act of Congress. I am aware of that. But very often our great national parks have begun as national monuments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that if it could be demonstrated to him that the Dinosaur National Monument would not be flooded out he would have no objection to the proposal?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say that if there would be no commercial development within a national monument, I would not object to the Echo Park Dam. But it would flood out the Dinosaur National Monument—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not. It would flood a part of the 203,000 acres within the extension, preserving the power rights. It would not cover the entire extended national monument, and not 1 acre of the original monument.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wyoming and I could argue from now until next Christmas about what the Executive order accomplished. The Executive order reserved only the Brown's Park site, on the extreme northern edge of the monument. If it reserved anything, that was the only part it reserved. It did not reserve the Echo Park site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon is now making interpretations of

the Executive order, which contains specific language. The Senator acknowledges that he is not a lawyer. I say to him that his argument ought to be satisfactorily answered for him by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior under Harold Ickes, who was a defender of conservation of the national parks, that the power rights were being preserved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. One of the specific things which Solicitor Margold said was that the Federal Power Commission Act did not apply so far as national monuments were concerned.

Again, I return to the status of national monuments and national parks. In most instances, if the original monument had not been preserved, there would have been no park later on for Congress to create. I cite the Olympic National Park as an example.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was no national monument preceding Yellowstone; there was no national monument preceding Grand Teton; there was no national monument preceding Glacier National Park in Montana. In fact, I do not know of any national monument which preceded a national park, except Olympic; and I would have forgotten that had not the Senator referred to it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe there is still a Grand Canyon National Monument. Am I not correct? I cannot say definitely, because I do not have the documents with me. I believe there is still Grand Canyon National Monument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is in Arizona. I am not certain about that. The fact is that a national park is created by act of Congress; a national monument is created by an act of the Executive. In this instance, although the Senator may argue about it, there was specific language in the Executive order, and there were interpretations of the order, making it clear that what is happening now, on the part of those whom the Senator is now defending, is a raid on the possibilities of power development in the upper Colorado Basin. If the Senator from Oregon wants power development in his area, I hope he will give it to us in our area.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to say to my good friend, whose career I have so long admired, that I remember, when I was a new member of the Young Democrats in 1934, hearing a speech by the man who is now the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming. I believe that then he was an Assistant Postmaster General of the United States. He came to my city of Portland, where I heard him deliver a very eloquent and persuasive address. The 21 years which have intervened certainly have not dimmed his ability to make his point.

I appreciate his support of the Hells Canyon project. There are 39 various projects comprised in the upper Colorado Basin. I am supporting 38 of them. I wish, because of my admiration for the Senator, I could support all 39; but I am supporting 38 of them with all the vigor at my command.

If the Senator had been present during the early part of my remarks, I think he would have observed, as he will if he has the patience and forbearance to read my

remarks tomorrow, when the RECORD is delivered at his doorstep, that my support of those 38 projects is no less enthusiastic than is his own.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I listened to almost every word the Senator has uttered. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the argument he presented at the beginning of his address. It seems to me that he has completely answered and utterly destroyed the arguments on the ground of alleged subsidy which have been made against the general subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator sincerely. I also wish to say to him that although he may not agree with me as to my stand on Echo Park—and it is obvious that he does not—I have tried to be consistent. I have applied to my own region the rule which I have tried to apply to his region.

RULE SHOULD APPLY TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST

In the Pacific Northwest, where I live, and where I was born and reared, various demands have been made, which are still in progress, to bring about commercial development within the national park system. Much of that pressure has been brought to cut lumber in the Olympic National Park. This I have opposed. I have opposed it as a member of my State legislature, as a journalist, and as a Member of the United States Senate.

I have opposed the proposed construction of Glacier View Dam, within the Glacier National Park, although such a dam would provide storage that would increase the power production on the lower Columbia River, which is, of course, very important to my own State.

So the Senator from Wyoming can at least see that I am willing to apply to my own State and my own region the same standard concerning the national park system as I am applying to his region. I am not trying to propose one law for the goose and another for the gander.

Mr. President, I have been sent carbon copies of a number of letters which have been written to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] with reference to the views he has expressed in supporting the construction of Echo Park Dam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a telegram of April 16, 1955, from Mr. Richard M. Leonard, president of the Sierra Club; a letter dated April 15, 1955, from Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation; a letter dated April 16, 1955, from Mr. Fred Smith, Council of Conservationists; a letter of April 15, 1955, from Gen. U. S. Grant 3d; and a letter dated yesterday, April 18, 1955, from Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 16, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: We acknowledge that this message is being rushed, but in view of the haste with which the Colorado River project is being considered in Congress we are wiring.

Thank you for your courteous letter of April 5, transmitting a copy of your statement of March 31 before the Senate.

The documents you cite concerning the effort of the 1938 Presidential proclamation on early power and reclamation withdrawals present arguments that have been fully set forth in the hearings before the previous Congress. Those arguments have been known for years to the Sierra Club and other competent national conservation organizations. They have been fully and objectively analyzed. The true situation can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Brown's Park withdrawal: There seems to be no question concerning the authority and intention of the President to enlarge Dinosaur National Monument, "Subject to the (repeat the) Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." The Federal Water Power Act of 1920 was made applicable to confirm the authority of the Federal Power Commission to administer that withdrawal.

2. All other withdrawals were superseded by the Presidential proclamation. It is part of our American way of life to have the opportunity for strong presentation of diverse viewpoints and then to have a final decision made by one who has authority and responsibility to settle the matter. The Federal Power Commission quite properly took a strong parochial interest in refusing voluntarily to release its jurisdiction over a number of the power filings and withdrawal which have been cited. The President concluded, however, after review of both sides of the matter, that the national interest would best be served by establishing the enlarged national monument subject only to the one (repeat one) reclamation withdrawal at Brown's Park at the extreme upper edge of the monument.

3. Evaporation: It is indeed amazing to see that the evaporating arithmetic of the Bureau of Reclamation is still being cited nearly 11 months after Under Secretary Tudor formally apologized to the previous Congress for the Bureau's miscalculations.

4. Finally, a precedent is established. I am sure you will agree, whenever Congress does something it has never done before. Congress has never permitted a dam to invade the national park system in any circumstances.

In the foregoing we use the repeat device only because Western Union has no better way to transmit emphasis. We appreciate your courtesy and again wish to stress that the Sierra Club does not oppose a sound upper Colorado project that does not adversely affect national parks, national monuments, or dedicated wilderness areas.

Respectfully,

RICHARD M. LEONARD,
President.

APRIL 15, 1955.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Thank you for your long letter of April 5 in which you sent me a copy of your statement and brief which you presented at the House subcommittee hearing on the Colorado storage project. I had picked up a copy of your brief from the press table in the hearing room and, therefore, had enjoyed a previous opportunity to study it.

I have been interested in this latest argument advanced by yourself and other proponents of Echo Park Dam: That Dinosaur National Monument is subject to various previous withdrawals and reservations for power and reclamation, and that as a result Echo Park Dam would not be an invasion but rather the national monument "invaded the previous reservations." This conclusion, Senator WATKINS, can be arrived at only by the kind of double-jointed logic which law-

yers have to be capable of in order to represent clients on either side of a case.

Because opposing advocates in the legal profession can take the same set of facts and arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions, yet pretended to be completely logical, the court has to use commonsense in reaching a decision. I am not a lawyer, but it is obvious to me that Congress and the public are going to have to use commonsense to arrive at a fair and intelligent conclusion in the Echo Park Dam controversy.

All of the old withdrawals and reservations listed in your brief and cited in your arguments were made by proclamation or Executive order by various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me only commonsense that a later proclamation by the highest executive officer, namely, the President, in the 1938 proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument, takes precedence over and cancels the previous withdrawals and reservations. Such was the opinion of a Department of Interior Solicitor who was quoted by your distinguished colleague in Congress, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, shortly after you left the House committee hearing on March 28. As I recall, that particular document was overlooked in your own argument.

As you know, the 1938 proclamation made the national monument enlargement subject only to one previous reservation, and that was the reclamation withdrawal for a dam at the Brown's Park site near the extreme northern edge of the area.

Here is another point of commonsense that I feel the Members of Congress will understand: Even the Brown's Park site reservation does not authorize construction of a hydroelectric dam by the Bureau of Reclamation in the national monument area. Only Congress can vote such authorization. For that reason the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior are at the present time asking Congress to enact authorizing legislation.

Congress has been asked to authorize dams and reservoirs in national parks and monuments before. It has never done so since the establishment of the national park system in 1916. Hence, if Congress should vote to authorize Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument, it would be the first time. It would be a clear precedent. And it would be a precedent that would be used as a powerful argument in favor of any future proposals to build a similar project in another national park or monument.

I agree entirely, Senator WATKINS, with the view expressed in the last paragraph of your letter. There is no place for bitterness in the discussion and debate on the issues.

Sincerely yours,
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

NEW YORK CITY, April 16, 1955.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your very long and involved speech concerning the needless invasion of Dinosaur National Monument discloses several routine documents and makes interesting speculations about them. The case it sets out to build, however, is academic.

Your point is that power withdrawals were made in the present protected Dinosaur area long before this area became a national monument. The proclamation specifies that valid existing rights would be honored. You contend that the withdrawals are valid existing rights because the Federal Power Commission did not voluntarily vacate the withdrawals, but gratuitously offered to let the President proclaim a monument as long as he did not interfere with the Federal Power

Commission; therefore, the Federal Power Commission claims are still in force. This point of view is concurred in by the Federal Power Commission, which is not surprising, but since when does the unilateral declaration of a participant in a dispute settle the dispute?

You attempt to bolster your case in an oblique way by slipping in commentary and references to law intended to convey the impression that the enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument may in itself be illegal or improper because the area is now larger than necessary to protect the bed of bones in the original 80 acres. But do you find anything in the proclamation of 1938 indicating that this enlargement was intended to provide further protection for the bones? You will find evidence of such intent in Wilson's original proclamation, but not in Roosevelt's. Isn't it possible that the new area was set aside for quite different reasons—for the preservation of the historic canyons and the striking evidences of early Indian life that abound in Echo Park and other parts of the new area? You will recall that your evidence reveals the new area was originally planned as the Yampa Canyon National Monument, obviously to protect the Yampa Canyons, which you now propose to flood out.

Sometime before the proclamation the name was changed and the new and old areas were consolidated, probably because it would simplify matters to have one national monument rather than two in tandem.

Since it was the obvious intention of Messrs. Roosevelt and Ickes to prevent invasion of the Yampa Canyons, perhaps because they knew these dangerous withdrawals had been made in the area, there is little wonder that repeated efforts were made to eliminate possible bureaucratic conflicts by getting the Federal Power Commission to vacate its claims, which your legal advisers say could have been established by "the mere filing of an application for water privileges." And the continued refusal of the Federal Power Commission might easily have inspired the President to insert the important word "valid" before "existing rights" in the proclamation. Looking forward to the day when the Federal Power Commission might want to invade the area, he determined to protect the public interest. Only Congress could determine the validity of a claim staked out prior to the establishment of an area in which the claimant has, by law, no rights.

So the matter falls back into the lap of Congress. There is no easy way out. If Congress decides to continue protection of the area which is now threatened, the area which the monument was proclaimed to protect, then it can strike Echo Park from the upper Colorado project, and can do it without seriously interfering with the lives or economics of the 3 million people you speak of, a small portion of whom will be served by Echo Park Dam, and no other. Such an action will automatically nullify the withdrawals, if indeed they still exist, as a result of the very same law which specifically places national parks and monuments beyond the reach of the Federal Power Commission.

It may be a neat legal question as to whether the proclamation of 1938 actually creates a monument, or whether it only provides elbow room for mud flats. But it will be settled finally and forever by the action of this session of Congress when it rejects, as we hope it will, or authorizes Echo Park Dam. And there is only one issue before Congress on this matter—whether or not it wishes to nullify the fundamental intent of President Roosevelt in creating what was originally conceived as Yampa Canyon National Monument, in which it is reasonable to suppose he hoped there would be only 1 power development out of the 11 staked out by the Federal

Power Commission. This one was at Browns Park. It would not interfere with the Yampa Canyons, and it was specifically excepted, by name, in the proclamation.

Whatever profusion of words is hurled about to confuse the issue, posterity and lobbyists for private interests will regard this vital congressional decision as either a reaffirmation of the traditional policy of protecting national monuments and parks—or as setting a precedent that in the judgment of Congress such areas have lost their value.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SMITH,

Director, Council of Conservationists.

APRIL 15, 1955.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your sending me a copy of your recent speech on the upper Colorado River storage project, together with your letter of April 5, was very much appreciated, especially as I had not previously been able to obtain a copy. Your speech and the exhibits accompanying it are evidence of your ability as a lawyer and advocate, a fact which I have never doubted and for years appreciated.

It would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to argue at length any legal points with you. Moreover, I do not have the means or facilities to search for possible evidence upon which to base such an argument. Therefore, I am constrained to accept the withdrawals preceding the enlargement of the monument and the refusal of the Federal Power Commission to vacate them as established facts. However, since the Utah Power & Light Co. voluntarily withdrew their application, it appears that the withdrawals in force in 1938 were not vested rights in private property, but merely the earmarking of certain areas by a bureau of the Federal Government (by authority of Congress, to be sure) for a certain future use, that they did not establish any vested private property right, but were an administrative reservation of those areas for a use subsequently not made of them. Therefore, they were not recognized or protected by the subject to all valid existing rights clause, a general formula to protect the Government against the possible unintentional taking of private property without due process of law.

I do not believe it can be denied that such an earmarking of an area for a future use by one Government agency, which could have been disallowed by the President in the first place, may, if not so used in a reasonable length of time, be transferred to other Federal use by the President. This is what it seems to me to have been done by the 1938 Executive order enlarging the monument. To my simple mind, it seems logical to assume that the writer and issuer of the Executive order said what they meant and meant what they said. This view is confirmed by the explicit exemption in the order of one withdrawal (the Brown Park site) and no others, and by the specific provision for any exceptions to the full park use in the laws establishing certain national parks. I have always understood that the courts have generally held that the explicit mention of one exception in a legal document precludes others from being inferred.

It is pertinent and conclusive that the Executive order, after the clause "subject to all valid existing rights," goes on to say explicitly that the lands added "are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument"—manifestly all the withdrawals for power or irrigation previously made under the public land laws, which the courts have held do not apply to national parks and monuments, were explicitly rescinded by the

proclamation with the one exception of the Brown's Park site. I do not see how there could be a clearer prescription contrary to your interpretation and in support of mine. The inter-agency correspondence between Mr. Demaray and Mr. McNinch was manifestly and intentionally overruled by the President and is no longer pertinent. It is hardly necessary to point out that, in order to prevent any doubt, the proclamation goes on to warn explicitly all against any inconsistent invasion or use of the land within the enlarged monument and even rescinds previous Executive orders making certain withdrawals.

The subsequent paragraph makes the specific exception of the Brown's Park site, but, in order that there could be no misunderstanding, says that the Federal Power Act shall prevail and it, as amended in 1935, denies to the Federal Power Commission any authority to issue permits for power development in the national parks or monuments.

Thus, Senator, on a mere layman's analysis of the question—and I have truly studied your presentation before the Senate carefully and conscientiously in the light of my nearly 50 years experience in Government administration—I am constrained most respectfully to stand by my previous interpretations of the legal status of the case against the Echo Park and Split Mountain dams, and as Shakespeare said—

"It must not be; there is no power in Venice

Can alter a decree established;

'Twill be a precedent;

And many an error by the same example
Will rush into the state."

We are more fortunate than Venice and Congress can by direct legislation, as now proposed, provide for this exception to its own previous enjoiner as to the maintenance of national parks and monuments to "leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations"; but it will still be a precedent, a breach of a sound policy adhered to since 1916, and we hope the Congress will be wise and foresighted in this case, as in the past, and not pass the legislation.

Of course, I am confident that in your advocacy of the proposed legislation you are conscientiously acting for what you believe the best interests of your constituents and of the Nation; just as I am conscientiously advocating the contrary. How the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to convince so many intelligent and experienced men that this program is sound and economically feasible, is a great mystery to me. Having felt that Mr. Brown's and my statements sufficiently showed the contrary, and that the water your region so much needs and the requirements of the interstate compact can be otherwise provided for at less expense and with greater actual benefit to the region, it is hard to understand the ignoring of these statements and the continued support of a program which is evidently going to be so damaging to the Nation both economically and by destruction of one of its important assets, which should be preserved as part of our natural heritage.

The fact that the impossibility of the Echo Park Dam paying out, as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the extravagance of power costs in its program, certainly established the fact that its cost estimates and economic analysis do not merit your confidence. As president of the American Planning and Civic Association, I was more or less constrained to focus my statements on the objections to the Echo Rock Dam and the fact that it is unnecessary because there are alternative and better solutions. But as a citizen and a former officer, owing so much to the Government and loyal to what I believe to be the best interests of the country at large, I did venture to indicate the program's unsoundness and the superficiality

and probably untrustworthiness of the Bureau's analysis. But nothing has come of it. Neither the Chief of Engineers nor the Federal Power Commission, nor even the National Park Service, have been called in to testify, nor any nationally known engineers or economists. Only we conservationists, former Governor Miller, and the opponents from the lower basin were heard, and our statements have been treated with courteous disregard. We have been voices crying in the wilderness. While I realize that your committee could not expect to take my lone statements, however carefully prepared and still unanswered by the Bureau, without supporting views of competent persons in whom you had more confidence, you have continued to believe in a bad and unsound program, and in the assurances of those proven wrong in so many instances.

My high regard for you personally, and your splendid services in the National Congress, make it very painful to differ with you so radically on this subject; and my appreciation of human fallibility appraises me of the audacity of my differing with one of such long experience and great ability. However, I can find nothing in my 4 years connection with this case to raise a doubt as to the correctness of my analysis and conclusions, so I am constrained to continue to differ with you and to believe that the Congress and the Nation are entitled, when the question is raised, to a candid statement of the views to which I have been impelled.

Respectfully yours,

U. S. GRANT 3D.

NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION,

Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your 5-page letter of April 5, and the enclosed copy of your March 28 speech on the upper Colorado River storage project, have been studied carefully. While we expected that an eminent lawyer of your known ability would present a strong legal argument for that billion-dollar project, it occurs to us that the Echo Park Dam issue was documented too well.

When you charge that the Dinosaur National Monument actually constituted an invasion of previously authorized power withdrawals, and that those withdrawals have priority over the use of the land, you should not have so conveniently included that December 5, 1930, opinion of Nathan R. Margold, former solicitor of the Department of the Interior. All of your contentions were refuted by Mr. Margold's statement that "It is clear that the Federal Power Commission is by statute expressly prohibited from granting licenses for power works within national monuments. In my opinion of August 19, 1938, I so held. It follows that if the lands affected by the power site classifications are included in the national monument, the Federal Power Commission will be without authority to grant licenses affecting them. Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an executive proclamation of this character."

It has been charged repeatedly that the National Park Service promised in the 1936 hearings in Utah that Echo Park Dam could be built within the expanded boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Surely, an agency vested with the tremendous responsibility of administering our national park system was cognizant of the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Act, which provides that no power licenses shall

be issued in any existing or new national parks or monuments. The National Park Service had no authority to make such a promise—that authority rests with the Congress. Furthermore, the Park Service representatives who conducted those Utah hearings were instructed by the then Interior Secretary, Harold L. Ickes, that the future development of water, power, and minerals would be determined by the Congress. In fact, the recorded proceedings of those hearings show that not one word was said about water development.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Secretary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to say further, with respect to the general policy of protecting scenic areas, that in the Pacific Northwest it is my opinion that the last commercial projects which should be undertaken anywhere, be they in the national parks, the national monuments, the national forests, or elsewhere, should be those which will destroy scenic or wildlife values.

FISHING SHOULD BE PROTECTED

For example, the Governor of Oregon, in testifying during the Hells Canyon hearings in Portland several weeks ago, suggested that perhaps greater flood control than that to be achieved at Hells Canyon could be gained by damming the Salmon River in Idaho. Perhaps the Governor of Oregon is right; I do not know. But if the suggestion of the Governor of Oregon were followed about possibly damming the Salmon River in Idaho, that would be the end of commercial fishing and of sports fishing on the Columbia River, because about 80 percent of the annual spring run of chinook salmon spawns in the headwaters of the Salmon River. I have been camping at the headwaters near Agency Creek and have seen the fish spawning where Lewis and Clark came. They nearly form a bridge across the Salmon River. But if we would follow the notion of the Governor of Oregon and dam the Salmon River for flood control, needed though it might be, the salmon-fishing industry and the great sports fishing on the lower Columbia would be destroyed.

We have proposals in the Northwest to build dams at Bruce's Eddy and at Penny Cliffs on the Clearwater River. They would be great dams. Yet those dams would flood out the great Selway Wilderness area and the Lochsa Wilderness area.

I have camped with Mrs. Neuberger on the Lochsa and on the Lolo Trail, which is one part of the original Lewis and Clark trail that is still wild. I think it would be shameful, now, to have a lake or reservoir at the Lochsa and at the Selway and to flood out those great elk meadows and to eliminate the areas that stretch up the Lolo trail where Lewis and Clark bivouaced and which is the last place where Americans can see what our country must have been like as the first white men camped there. I think to build dams in scenic areas before the very last potential kilowatt is utilized elsewhere would be a crime against future generations of Americans.

I have taken the position, and have held to it all my adult life, that the last

power and irrigation projects that ought to be built are those that destroy scenic and recreational values and the wildlife of our country.

As we pass the 160 million mark in population, we have all too few places like the Lochsa Wilderness area and like the Dinosaur National Monument, where people can go and somehow get away from the tensions and anxieties of the civilization we have created.

OREGON WILDLIFE FEDERATION OPPOSES ECHO PARK DAM

On April 14, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] wrote to me a letter stating that the State wildlife federations of some States had dissented from the stand against Echo Park Dam taken by the National Wildlife Federation.

The resolution of the National Wildlife Federation opposing the construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument was adopted at the Federation's 19th annual convention in Montreal last month. The letter of the Senator from Utah said that the delegate from the Oregon Wildlife Federation, which supported this stand last year, had voted against the resolution at the Montreal convention this year.

However, Mr. Carl B. Ramsey, the fine president of the Oregon Wildlife Federation, has wired me that the Oregon group is still opposed to construction of any dam within a national park or monument. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the National Wildlife Federation opposing Echo Park Dam, the letter of the Senator from Utah to me, and Mr. Ramsey's telegram to me, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 9, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, OPPOSING ECHO PARK DAM

Whereas the national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being supported and enjoyed by millions of people; and

Whereas progressive losses of recreational facilities in the various States apparently cannot be stopped, and recreational lands increased for the use of all of the people; and

Whereas such continuing loss in the light of increased use of outdoor recreational opportunities makes this condition alarming; and

Whereas any legislation that would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah would open the way for further destruction of other recreational areas in our monuments and parks; and

Whereas the alternatives that have been offered have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proven inferior; and

Whereas the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been fully demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in line with its policy of fighting for increased recreational opportunities for all of the people, take every action possible to oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam and to preserve the Dinosaur National Monument as it is now constituted, and to do everything possible to see that our national park system is not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 14, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It may have escaped your attention, but the sportsmen in your State affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation recently reconsidered their previous opposition to Echo Park Dam and voted against a 1955 resolution of the national organization, which opposes this unit of the proposed Colorado River storage project.

This was disclosed by Charles S. Caillson, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in an appearance before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee on March 28. The Federation's resolution, opposed by 11 States which had favored a similar resolution in 1954, actually was approved by only 30 States represented at the organization's annual convention in Montreal, Canada, March 11 to 13. It is my conviction that many of these remaining States also would change their position if they had access to all the facts.

I felt obligated to bring this matter before you, because the House hearing record has not yet been printed, and because I feel assured that the propagandists of the National Wildlife Federation will not direct your attention to such a reversal of position by so many of their State affiliates.

Wildlife groups in these 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming—now have joined the national Congress of Industrial Organizations in taking a public stand in favor of Echo Park Dam, after examining all the facts. The Utah Wildlife Federation has always supported Echo Park Dam.

Some of the facts on Echo Dam are set forth in the enclosed reprint of my recent floor speech on this subject.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

WALLA WALLA, WASH., April 17, 1955.
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Wildlife Federation is on record as opposing any legislation that would constitute an invasion of our national park system. If F. R. Brown, our alternate delegate to the National Wildlife Federation meeting in Montreal, voted favoring Echo Park Dam, he voted uninstructed and certainly did not express the sentiment of the Oregon Wildlife Federation.

CARL B. RAMSEY,
President, Oregon Wildlife Federation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I was impressed by the able speech of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico when he cited the reclamation history in our country. Yet, a very illustrious American who was closely associated with the Senator from New Mexico when the Senator served so ably as the Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Truman, and who has great affection for the Senator from New Mexico, has taken an opposite position. When the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the United States Forest Service, who served under the Senator from New Mexico and served so closely with him, was Lyle F. Watts. Mr. Watts is not a man who opposes sound commercial development where it can take place. Under his tenure as Chief of the Forest

Service, timber cutting showed an increase of 200 or 300 percent to meet the exigencies of our wartime needs during World War II. Yet Mr. Watts, who is now one of the most beloved and most distinguished residents of my home community of Portland, Oreg., has taken the position that the proposed dam at Echo Park should not be built.

I realize, I might point out, that Echo Park is not in the truest sense a park, but is merely a point within the Dinosaur National Monument. I should like to read the letter which I received from the distinguished ex-Chief of the Forest Service:

PORTLAND, OREG., April 15, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: For many years I have been interested in the development of the upper Colorado Basin. I lived in the intermountain region for 18 years and know that the area badly needs to store its available water for agriculture, power, and industry. I retired as chief of the United States Forest Service on June 30, 1952.

Again I have opposed the invasion of our national parks and monuments for commercial purposes. Generally we have too little rather than too much area set aside for that purpose. The present overuse of existing areas coupled with the rapid increase in our population substantiates that belief.

It is my considered opinion that the above two premises need not be conflicting as related to the Colorado River.

S. 500 now before the Senate would authorize the development of the upper Colorado Basin. As the bill now reads one of the many projects for which authorization is sought is the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. It is my interpretation of the situation that the rest of the development would be feasible without Echo Park Dam.

I strongly urge that the Senate approve S. 500 only if the Echo Park Dam is excluded. Sincerely,

LYLE F. WATTS.

I have read the full text of this letter so that I may call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that many of the people who oppose Echo Park Dam are not enemies, in any sense of the word, of the upper Colorado storage project as a whole. Mr. Watts, up to the time when he reached the pinnacle of his career as chief of the United States Forest Service, was regional forestry director at Missoula, and he served in Utah, Montana, and Colorado. He knows the Upper Colorado region. He knows the truth of what the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have said about the need for putting water on this arid land, which can support many crops if only it can receive irrigation. He supports the project as a whole, but he, like many other people who understand the situation, are opposed to the Echo Park Dam.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a considerable number of messages which I have received from other persons who are interested in conservation and the protection of our resources, regarding

the Echo Park feature of the upper Colorado project.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAZAMAS,

Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: We are very pleased and proud of your stand against the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the upper Colorado project.

We believe that any breach in the national park system will result in further violations, and we can see no justification for the violation of Dinosaur National Monument at this time.

In appreciation for your action, we shall do all we can to support you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT and MARTHA PLATT.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 19, 1955.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you oppose outrageous inclusion Echo Park Dam in upper Colorado River development.

PAMELA S. OLMSTEAD
Mrs. H. C. Olmstead,
VIRGINIA B. OLMSTEAD
Mrs. L. S.,
ROBERT S. BOUTELL.

EVERETT, WASH., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you go through with your amendment to the upper Colorado bill. It is certainly desirable.

PHILIP H. ZALESKY.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to be on record as supporting the amendment to S. 500 for the deletion of Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado River storage project.

WILLIAM A. DEGENHARDT.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We object to Echo Park Dam being included in upper Colorado River storage project and urge your support in having it deleted from present bill.

WARD and LOIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The questionable economic soundness of upper Colorado project is poor excuse for wrecking Dinosaur National Monument. Urge deletion of Echo Park Dam from S. 500. Reservoir recreation abundantly available elsewhere but no amount of money can ever replace the national park system. Let's save it.

V. L. and M. L. FISCHER.

BOZEMAN, MONT., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your continued and unswerving opposition to inclusion of Echo Park Dam in upper Colorado development. genuine justification entirely lacking. Log-rolling and political back scratching passes rivers and harbors bills but whole national park principle is at stake today. Delete Echo Park

site and upper Colorado development acceptable to all.

NICK ELBURN.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed to Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. I strongly urge you to support an amendment to upper Colorado bill to eliminate this dam from project. I appreciate need for water in West's arid regions but also see increasing need for national parks of exceptional natural beauty.

VICTOR JOSENDAL.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We proudly commend your stand for the deletion of Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado project. We strongly oppose any invasion of Dinosaur National Monument and urge Senate consideration and study of alternate sites without the monument. Best wishes.

MARTHA and ROBERT PLATT.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please help preserve Dinosaur National Monument by voting against the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the Colorado River project.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN D. HEATH.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest against Echo Park Dam Dinosaur National Monument.

Respectfully,

VIRGINIA WIRTANEN.

OSWEGO, OREG., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Dinosaur National Monument must not be scuttled to build Echo Park Dam. The National Park System was created to perpetuate singular irreplaceable natural features and violating its policy for cheap hydroelectric power is false economy and shortsighted with atomic power's potential uncertain.

Mr. and Mrs. W. H. OBERTEUFFER.

TACOMA, WASH., April 19, 1955.

Hon. R. L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Knowing your interest in our national parks I urge that you work for deletion of Echo Park Dam site in Dinosaur National Monument from the upper Colorado storage bill.

LEO GALLAGHER.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 19, 1955.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I oppose any needless encroachment upon our national parks and monuments and urge the deletion of Echo Park Dam from S. 500.

DONNEL N. WILLIAMS.

PASADENA, CALIF., April 16, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: While I don't live in Oregon, I lecture to about 2,000 Oregonians a year and could perhaps influence quite a few. I don't like the Echo Park

Dam. I hear you oppose it too and hope you can persuade a lot of Democrats to go along with you.

Any breach in our National Park System would encourage other selfish groups to try it. Our National Parks are shabby, run-down, understaffed, and overwhelmed by the crowds of tourists already. It seems almost treasonable that the Department of Interior should propose to destroy one of the very areas it is entrusted to protect. Dinosaur is the only sanctuary on the whole upper Colorado that was supposedly safe from that type of venal exploitation.

Echo Park Dam's proponents should be reminded: Strike out the Echo Park Dam and its pressure groups will in time forgive and forget. But conservationists will never forgive those responsible for desecration like that. The dam would stand as a reminder for all time. In fact, I can be counted on myself to remind a few hundred thousand people a year about the folly of Echo Park Dam. Let's hope I don't have to.

Sincerely,

STAN MIDGLEY.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,

Hanover, N. H., April 17, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Comparable letter to the attached has been mailed this date to each United States Senator from New England and New York.

Good luck with the Echo Park amendment. We appreciate your interest—and your promise of action.

Yours truly,

ROBERT S. MONAHAN,
College Forester and Manager of
College Outing Properties.

APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB,

Boston, Mass., April 17, 1955.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR NORRIS: I have been authorized by the officers of the Appalachian Mountain Club, with 5,000 members sufficiently interested in its outdoor program to pay annual dues of \$7.50, to express the club's opinion on the following subject.

We have followed with understandable interest congressional action with respect to S. 500, which authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project with amendments, as reported (No. 128) on March 30 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

We understand that when this bill reaches the floor shortly, probably on April 20, Senator NEUBERGER will offer an amendment that would exclude the controversial Echo Park Dam from the project.

Proponents of the Echo Park Dam, having failed to present a convincing case for its need for national defense, irrigation, or power purposes are currently concentrating on its alleged recreational benefits. We have personal knowledge and firm convictions in that field which oblige us to express our opinion that the Dinosaur National Monument will produce far greater public recreational benefits by not allowing the invasion of its unique terrain with a man-made dam and a fluctuating flowage.

The Appalachian Mountain Club hopes you will support the Neuberger amendment, thereby eliminating that portion of the project to which we strenuously object and leaving the balance of the program for such authorization as the Congress may consider feasible.

I have not forgotten your comment at the last session that you had received more correspondence on this one subject than upon any other, even those affecting New Hamp-

shire directly. Vote for the Neuberger amendment and you'll hear no more from the opponents of the Echo Park Dam.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. MONAHAN,
Chairman, Conservation Committee;
Forester, Dartmouth College.

COUNCIL OF CONSERVATIONISTS,

New York, N. Y., April 16, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your very long and involved speech concerning the needless invasion of Dinosaur National Monument discloses several routine documents and makes interesting speculations about them. The case it sets out to build, however, is academic.

Your point is that power withdrawals were made in the present protected Dinosaur area long before this area became a national monument. The proclamation specifies that valid existing rights would be honored. You contend that the withdrawals are valid existing rights because the Federal Power Commission did not voluntarily vacate the withdrawals, but gratuitously offered to let the President proclaim a monument as long as he did not interfere with the Federal Power Commission; therefore, the Federal Power Commission claims are still in force. This point of view is concurred in by the Federal Power Commission, which is not surprising, but since when does the unilateral declaration of a participant in a dispute settle the dispute?

You attempt to bolster your case in an oblique way by slipping in commentary and references to law intended to convey the impression that the enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument may in itself be illegal or improper because the area is now larger than necessary to protect the bed of bones in the original 80 acres. But do you find anything in the proclamation of 1938 indicating that this enlargement was intended to provide further protection for the bones? You will find evidence of such intent in Wilson's original proclamation, but not in Roosevelt's. Isn't it possible that the new area was set aside for quite different reasons—for the preservation of the historic canyons and the striking evidences of early Indian life that abound in Echo Park and other parts of the new area? You will recall that your evidence reveals the new area was originally planned as the "Yampa Canyon National Monument," obviously to protect the Yampa Canyons, which you now propose to flood out.

Sometime before the proclamation the name was changed and the new and old areas were consolidated, probably because it would simplify matters to have one national monument rather than two in tandem.

Since it was the obvious intention of Messrs. Roosevelt and Ickes to prevent invasion of the Yampa Canyons, perhaps because they knew these dangerous withdrawals had been made in the area, there is little wonder that repeated efforts were made to eliminate possible bureaucratic conflicts by getting the Federal Power Commission to vacate its claims, which your legal advisers say could have been established by "the mere filing of an application for water privileges." And the continued refusal of the Federal Power Commission might easily have inspired the President to insert the important word "valid" before "existing rights" in the proclamation. Looking forward to the day when the Federal Power Commission might want to invade the area, he determined to protect the public interest. Only Congress could determine the validity of a claim staked out prior to the establishment of an area in which the claimant has, by law, no rights.

So the matter falls back into the lap of Congress. There is no easy way out. If Con-

gress decides to continue protection of the area which is now threatened, the area which the monument was proclaimed to protect, then it can strike Echo Park from the upper Colorado project, and can do it without seriously interfering with the lives or economics of the 3 million people you speak of, a small portion of whom will be served by Echo Park Dam, and no other. Such an action will automatically nullify the withdrawals, if indeed they still exist, as a result of the very same law which specifically places national parks and monuments beyond the reach of the Federal Power Commission.

It may be a neat legal question as to whether the proclamation of 1938 actually creates a monument, or whether it only provides elbow room for mud flats. But it will be settled finally and forever by the action of this session of Congress when it rejects, as we hope it will, or authorizes Echo Park Dam. And there is only one issue before Congress on this matter—whether or not it wishes to nullify the fundamental intent of President Roosevelt in creating what was originally conceived as Yampa Canyon National Monument, in which it is reasonable to suppose he hoped there would be only 1 power development out of the 11 staked out by the Federal Power Commission. This one was at Brown's Park. It would not interfere with the Yampa Canyons, and it was specifically excepted, by name, in the proclamation.

Whatever profusion of words is hurled about to confuse the issue, posterity and lobbyists for private interests will regard this vital congressional decision as either a reaffirmation of the traditional policy of protecting national monuments and parks—or as setting a precedent that in the judgment of Congress such areas have lost their value.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SMITH,
Director.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON

NATURAL RESOURCES,

San Francisco, Calif., April 16, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: We acknowledge that this message is being rushed, but in view of the haste with which the Colorado River project is being considered in Congress we are wiring.

Thank you for your courteous letter of April 5, transmitting a copy of your statement of March 31 before the Senate.

The documents you cite concerning the effort of the 1938 Presidential proclamation on early power and reclamation withdrawals present arguments that have been fully set forth in the hearings before the previous Congress. Those arguments have been known for years to the Sierra Club and other competent national conservation organizations. They have been fully and objectively analyzed. The true situation can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Brown's Park withdrawal: There seems to be no question concerning the authority and intention of the President to enlarge Dinosaur National Monument "subject to the (repeat 'the') Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." The Federal Water Power Act of 1920 was made applicable to confirm the authority of the Federal Power Commission to administer that withdrawal.

2. All other withdrawals were superseded by the Presidential proclamation. It is part of our American way of life to have the opportunity for strong presentation of diverse viewpoints and then to have a final decision made by one who has authority and responsibility to settle the matter. The Federal Power Commission quite properly took a strong parochial interest in refusing voluntarily to release its jurisdiction over a number of the power filings and withdrawal which have been cited. The President con-

cluded, however, after review of both sides of the matter, that the national interest would best be served by establishing the enlarged national monument subject only to the one (repeat "one") reclamation withdrawal at Brown's Park at the extreme upper edge of the monument.

3. Evaporation: It is indeed amazing to see that the "evaporating" arithmetic of the Bureau of Reclamation is still being cited nearly 11 months after Under Secretary Tudor formally apologized to the previous Congress for the Bureau's miscalculations.

4. Finally, a precedent is established. I am sure you will agree, whenever Congress does something it has never done before. Congress has never permitted a dam to invade the national park system in any circumstances.

In the foregoing we use the "repeat" device only because Western Union has no better way to transmit emphasis. We appreciate your courtesy and again wish to stress that the Sierra Club does not oppose a sound upper Colorado project that does not adversely affect national parks, national monuments, or dedicated wilderness areas.

Respectfully,

RICHARD M. LEONARD,
President.

APRIL 16, 1955.

Senator NEUBERGER: I am in favor of the amendment excluding Echo Park from the upper Colorado project.

JUNE HAIGHT.

ALAMEDA, CALIF.

BERKELEY, CALIF., April 16, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to sincerely commend you for your vote in committee to delete the proposed dam in Echo Park of the Dinosaur Monument. I am sure conservationists all over the country were happy about that evidence of your understanding of the value of our national park system, and your intention to resist their invasion. I suspect too few of our law makers in Washington do have that clear understanding, and do recognize that outstanding values, even if in intangible denominations, are sometimes too great to sacrifice for local or regional economic gain. In this case there are so many other solutions to the problem, by which both park values and the desired conservation of the water can be secured, that it seems incomprehensible that the sacrifice should be condoned. Not incomprehensible for men from Utah, western Colorado and perhaps New Mexico and Arizona. Human nature does not change much—and the presentation of potential billions to the economy of the region, in the form of pork barrel, can be counted on to submerge more logical and far-sighted attitudes.

I do not happen to be one of your constituents—though I know a good many of them quite well. Your election was not entirely a surprise, because Secretary McKay did some very telling campaign work for you among those dedicated to preserve our fine parks unimpaired. Needless to say he did not realize it at the time he was adding his verbal approval for a tramway up Ranier, to his written approval of the Dinosaur sacrifice. I was delighted that you won the election. I have the feeling that we desperately need a Senator who really understands park values, and who is not unwilling to fight to preserve them. Your newness in the Senate may indeed be an advantage—if you are willing to take up the challenge, and take upon yourself the role of park champion. So far as I know there is a vacancy at that very point—and I am sincerely hoping you

will fill it, and that you can do so very effectively. It will be a grand role to play—and will bring you the sincere admiration and gratitude of millions of our people who do love our park system because they enjoy it, and other millions who have in the past visited and enjoyed the parks. One fifth of our total population will visit them this year, and the number mounts each season. The number actually visiting the Dinosaur—by the river route, which is the only way it can be really seen—will be up way above the number who visited Yosemite in 1893 when I first saw it. Yosemite now attracts a million a year.

My congratulations and sincere good wishes.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD C. BRADLEY,
Professor Emeritus,
Medical School, University of Wisconsin.

S. MCFARLAND CHAPTER,
IZAACK WALTON LEAGUE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., April 15, 1955.

SENATOR NEUBERGER: We are in back of you 100 percent and we are writing our opposition of the Echo Park Dam, in hopes that it will be of some value when the fight comes to the floor.

We oppose Echo Park Dam, but not sound development of the Colorado River.

Respectfully,

S. MCFARLAND CHAPTER,
FRANCES SWIMM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

P. S.—Letters have been sent to Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, also opposing this dam.

BOULDER, COLO., April 15, 1955.
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is just a line to tell you that "we the people" are greatly pleased at the stand you have taken on the Echo Park Dam controversy.

We were asked to send copies of our letters of protest to you. I cannot do that—but I can say that I have just written to Senators HARRY F. BYRD and PAUL DOUGLAS.

Very truly yours,

AMY M. BOWEN
(Mrs. Albert).

COLORADO CONSERVATIONIST OPPOSES ECHO PARK DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I stated earlier in my remarks that one of the things which surprised me very much was the fact that I had been receiving a number of letters from people in the upper Colorado Basin who themselves are opposed to Echo Park Dam. I have not chosen to put these letters into the RECORD, because I realize that perhaps feeling in those States is quite tense on this issue, and I would not want to subject the persons to embarrassment. I should like, however, to read parts of a letter from one of the most distinguished Colorado conservationists, Mr. Arthur H. Carhart, whose articles and books in the field of conservation are well known. I read from his letter:

The most serious issue involved in this controversy is the breaching of national park policy. Proponents of the dam argue it was contemplated that dams would be permitted in the Dinosaur National Monument at the time President Roosevelt's proclamation enlarged that park unit in 1938. * * *

The comparatively few who seem to think they will benefit or fulfill some commitments if they can force this dam into the national park unit will cry out that this will not be a breach in protections we have main-

tained for our parks, but the record denies their contentions. Congress can not afford to be confused in this issue; the future of the entire national park system is at stake.

Mr. President, I shall not read further from the letters; but I desire to comment on two editorials which have appeared in one of the finest newspapers in the intermountain West, namely, the Denver Post. The Denver Post, which supports the upper Colorado River project and the Echo Park phase of that project, has been critical of my position in this matter. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials from the Denver Post, one being from the issue of April 10, 1955, and the other being from the issue of April 14, 1955, both taking the opposing viewpoint from mine, and urging that the Echo Park feature of the upper Colorado project be authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of April 10, 1955]

A BAD ENTRANCE

It is reported that Senator NEUBERGER, Oregon's new Democratic Senator, will try to kill the Echo Park Dam when the upper Colorado River storage project bill comes before the Senate for vote. Mr. NEUBERGER is siding with the conservationists who believe the dam is a precedent-setting invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

The young Senator rejects the relative need and merits of that dam, as an essential unit for power production and water storage. He does not, in other words, accept the findings of engineering and economic justification which have compelled the Bureau of Reclamation to insist upon the Echo Park barrier as essential to the whole upper Colorado Basin project.

NEUBERGER does accept, however, the Bureau's case for the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. He embraces that project as an essential part of a basinwide river-control and power-producing plan to harness the Columbia and its tributaries. His whole case for the Hells Canyon Dam rests upon the studies and recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation—the same Bureau whose findings of fact and firm proposals in the case of Echo Park he rejects.

The legal questions involved in withdrawing the dam site from the national monument, and the effect of such withdrawal upon the inviolability of other monuments and national parks, were exhaustively explored a few days ago in the Senate by Senator WATKINS of Utah. NEUBERGER, we feel sure, is somewhat less of an authority on the administrative history of the monument and the statutory implications in the Colorado project bill, than is his colleague from Utah.

This suggests to us that the freshman Senator from the Pacific coast is plunging somewhat blindly into a controversy, and exposing himself to the grossest inconsistency of viewpoint in doing so. As champion of the Bureau's choice on the Snake his neck is out a mile for spurning one of the two essential facilities for the Bureau's plan on the Colorado.

Lacking full information on the history of the monument (as we believe he does), NEUBERGER appears to be working both sides of the street on this issue.

[From the Denver Post of April 14, 1955]

THE WHOLE TRUTH ON ECHO PARK DAM

On March 28, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, demolished the objection to the Echo Park Dam on grounds that it would "invade" the Dinosaur Monument and thereby establish precedent that would "threaten" the national park system.

WATKINS introduced records and correspondence which:

1. Established incontrovertibly that the Echo Park site was only one of several sites in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that had been withdrawn for power purposes by the Federal Power Commission several years before the monument was expanded in 1938.

2. Proved that the Department of Interior, including both Secretary Ickes and the National Park Service, were aware not only of the withdrawals, but of their lawful effect upon the nature and administration of the Dinosaur Monument before it was expanded by Presidential proclamation.

3. Revealed that the Department of Interior had been advised in 1939, through an opinion of its own solicitor, Nathan R. Margold, that a monument could be created "subject to the reclamation withdrawals and power site classifications and thereby preserve and continue the effectiveness of the withdrawals and classifications."

4. Affirmed that the "reservation" in President Roosevelt's monument proclamation was not (in Roosevelt's own words) to "affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * *." That is precisely the act under which the Echo Park and other sites were withdrawn by the FPC and described in 1934 by Chairman McNinch as * * * "one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

5. Supported his (WATKINS') contention that if "invasion" is taking place, the aggressors are those who are trying to set aside lawful power withdrawals and override the Federal Water Power Act to superimpose a national monument on an area that had been staked out for other purposes many years before 1938.

Before Roosevelt expanded the monument from its original 80 acres (1915) to 203,885 acres, the matter of "vacating" the power withdrawals was taken up with the FPC twice. The issue was raised first in 1934 by A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service. It was brought to the attention of the FPC again in 1935 by Secretary Ickes, who asked about the "possibility of releasing the power withdrawals" * * * thus to place the "proposed monument" * * * in a much better position from the standpoint of administration."

The power withdrawals were never vacated. The conservation groups opposed to the Echo Park Dam have not, to our knowledge, claimed that they were.

Apparently those opposing this dam are asking us to believe that the President himself, in his proclamation creating the monument, personally "vacated" the power withdrawals by failing to include them, specifically, in the exemptions of his statement. But if that were so why did Roosevelt specifically refer to "affect operation of the Water Power Act of 1920," under which the withdrawals were made and sustained by the decision of the FPC in 1934 and 1935?

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project are not "invading" this national monument. The conservationists, in an emotional and unreasoning mood, are trying in effect to rewrite both the record and the law by misleading the friends and champions of our natural playgrounds.

Listen to this: "Construction of Echo Park Dam * * * would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our national recreational reserves. Once the inviolability of the park

system is breached in Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Echo Park Dam is the beachhead from which a coordinated onslaught could be made by private interests against the boundaries of national parks. * * *

What about the "inviolability" of the Water Power Act or, for that matter, of the President's proclamation which cited it? Since when has a program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proceeding upon the clear authority of public law, become an "onslaught" similar to that of "private enterprise" imperiling the national park system?

Senator WATKINS' thorough, documented chronology of events up to and immediately following the act expanding the Dinosaur Monument exposes the error, presumably innocent of those who believe the dam "would set a fatal precedent."

If the power priorities on the Yampa and the Green may be thus arbitrarily ignored or set aside, then the Water Power Act of 1920 is without meaning, and the purposes and authority of the Federal Power Commission are canceled by implication. That we doubt will be accepted by Congress or was intended by Roosevelt in 1938. And it is a public disservice for the conservationists—with whom we have pleasurably joined in many worthy programs for the defense of natural values in this country—to proceed further down the wrong path they have taken.

PRESERVE OUR PARKS, REGARDLESS OF THE REGION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to discuss very briefly my reply to the editors of the Denver Post. I wish to say that these editors are personal friends of mine, and for them I have very great personal affection and respect. I should like to say that my reply points out what I said earlier to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] namely, that the position I have taken regarding Dinosaur National Monument is the same as the position I have taken regarding proposals that there be commercial development in the national parks within my own Pacific Northwest region. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my reply, dated April 19, 1955, to the editors of the Denver Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1955.

To the EDITOR OF THE DENVER POST:

Because of my respect for the editors of the Denver Post and their integrity, I would value the opportunity to reply to your editorial criticism of me because I am opposed to the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument.

1. You claim I am inconsistent because I favor Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River but oppose Echo Park Dam on the Green River.

If Hells Canyon Dam were inside a national park or monument, I would not recommend it. As a resident of the Northwest, I favor commercial timber-cutting in many areas but I oppose such cutting within the forests of the Olympic National Park. Is this being inconsistent? For many years, I have been against any commercial activity inside parks and monuments. I oppose Glacier View Dam in Glacier National Park, for example, quite as much as I oppose Echo Park Dam—although the Glacier View project would add to power production in the Columbia River basin, where I live.

2. You criticize me for accepting the recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation at Hells Canyon and rejecting them

at Echo Park.

The engineers who made the recommendation to build Echo Park Dam may not have given much weight to the intangible values of protecting the scenic beauty of a national monument, which they may have felt too irrelevant, but which the Senate has an obligation to consider. Remember that until Secretary McKay, no Secretary of the Interior had recommended authorization of Echo Park Dam. Secretary Chapman, himself from Denver, Colo., modified the report of the Bureau of Reclamation to omit Echo Park Dam pending further study of alternative sites.

For your information, it was the army engineers—in their famous 308 report—who made the original and basic recommendation that Hells Canyon Dam be erected.

3. You might comment on the inconsistency of some of the Senators from the Rocky Mountain States who advocate Echo Park Dam, Glen Canyon Dam, and others on the upper Colorado, but subscribe to the administration viewpoint that Hells Canyon Dam is "creeping socialism."

4. You accept without question Senator WATKINS' claim that the 1938 proclamation reserved the Echo Park waters for irrigation, power, etc. Yet this is by no means the only legal viewpoint. Legal experts as familiar with the upper Colorado as Senator WATKINS claim that Browns Park, and that alone, was the sole site preserved by the 1938 proclamation—and this on the extreme edge of the monument. Furthermore, the Solicitor of the Interior Department held as early as 1939 that the proclamation could not give the Federal Power Commission authority over dinosaur sites which exceeded prevailing national monument policy.

To argue these legal points could become endless without reaching the basic question at issue, as I see it: Shall a commercial dam be authorized by Congress, for the first time in American history, for construction within the boundaries of a national park or monument?

I believe the answer ought to be in the negative.

There are approximately 15 similar proposals all over the land for dams, tunnels or water diversions in parks and monuments. I oppose them all—those in my own region and in other regions.

You contend Echo Park would not be a fatal precedent, leading to these further invasions. Can you safely make so categorical a statement?

I fear Echo Park would lead eventually to the other invasions. After all, the irrigationists and power users proposing the other park and/or monument invasions can make arguments quite as compelling as those of the upper Colorado advocates.

I believe there can be found alternative sites to Echo Park which would leave our national park system intact. This is important in an era when so few wonder spots actually have been preserved for future generations.

I believe you will be interested to learn that my mail, including letters from the State of Colorado, is running heavily in support of the conviction that our national park system should be left alone so far as any exploitation or diversion is concerned.

You have said I plunged blindly and recklessly into the controversy. For 20 years as a journalist and a State legislator, I have held firmly to the position that commercial activity was undesirable in national parks and monuments. I have maintained this stand in the Pacific Northwest, despite the desire of major lumber interests to fell some of the magnificent fir and spruce "rain forests" of the Olympics. It has not always been easy to stick to such a stand in the face of local pressures and opinion, but I have not deviated.

I hope that the editors of the Denver Post, for whom I have a high personal affection and regard, will come eventually to think that my stand on Echo Park Dam is at least worthy of their respect—if not their agreement.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

BOOK DEPICTS GRANDEUR OF DINOSAUR MONUMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, through contributions from conservationists throughout the country, there has been sent to every Member of the Senate, I believe, during the past week, a book entitled "This Is Dinosaur." The book is published by Alfred A. Knopf & Co., one of the leading book publishers in the United States. The book includes essays by leading advocates of conservation, by river runners, by wildlife experts, by geologists, by botanists, and by others, who do not wish to see a dam constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument. I should like to read three paragraphs from the book, so that the gist of what these conservationists have said will appear in the RECORD. I shall read from the chapter entitled "The National Park Idea." It is a contribution to the book by Mr. Alfred A. Knopf, himself.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the book was edited by Mr. Wallace Stegner, one of the most widely known and talented novelists in the Nation.

I read now what Mr. Knopf says:

Thirty-five years ago one George K. Davol wanted to build a cableway across the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. To Stephen T. Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, this seemed, as it would seem to almost anyone today, simply monstrous. John Barton Payne, his Secretary of the Interior, supported Mather's denial of the request, and that was that. Another proposal called for the building of an elevator alongside the 308-foot Great Falls of the Yellowstone. And Secretary Franklin K. Lane was at one time eager to use Yellowstone Lake—the largest body of water in America at so great an altitude, 7,731 feet—for irrigation. That would have made it a draw-down reservoir, with results to its beauty that we can imagine but do not like to visualize. In his 1919 report, Mather wrote: "Is there not some place in this great Nation of ours where lakes can be preserved in their natural state; where we and all generations to follow us can enjoy the beauty and charm of mountain waters in the midst of primeval forests? The country is large enough to spare a few such lakes and beauty spots. The Nation has wisely set apart a few national parks where a state of nature is to be preserved. If the lakes and forests of these parks cannot be spared from the hand of commercialization, what hope can there be for the preservation of any scenic features of the mountains in the interest of posterity?"

The story of the years-long attempt by Ralph Henry Cameron, onetime Senator from Arizona, to keep the Grand Canyon region from being adequately developed as a park is too long to tell here. Mining claims were the chief basis of Cameron's power, and only the Supreme Court was able finally to polish him off.

There are always some people who want to mine in the parks, cut timber, graze cattle, build ski lifts and aerial tramways, turn into four-lane superhighways the roads that now are quiet and self-effacing and built so that those who drive them can see in peace and relaxation what they came to see. There is constant pressure to develop resort

and recreational facilities which could not be placed in any park without impairing it for the present as well as for future generations. Such facilities, moreover, are not needed in the parks; they exist in abundance outside, in hundreds of resort areas as well as on most reclamation lakes and to a limited degree in the national forests.

Mr. President, that is the end of the quotation I shall read from Mr. Knopf. I cite it merely to show what a very distinguished representative American thinks of this basic issue.

WOMEN'S CLUBS URGE CONSERVATION OF SCENIC WONDERS

Mr. President, before I conclude, I wish to say this issue is important to many Americans. I now hold in my hand a telegram from a very beloved lady in my own State, Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford, of Arlington, Oreg. She is conservation chairman of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States. She supports the upper Colorado project, but urges deletion of the Echo Park plan.

I also have before me a telegram from Howard Zahniser, Washington representative of the Council of Conservationists. His telegram is along the same general theme. I ask unanimous consent that both telegrams be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON, OREG., April 19, 1955.
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to delete Echo Park Dam from Senate bill 500.

Mrs. MARION T. WEATHERFORD,
Conservation Chairman,
General Federation of Womens Clubs.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 17, 1955.
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The upper Colorado storage project, S. 500, is scheduled for Senate action today, Monday, April 18. This bill includes the unnecessary location of a dam, the Echo Park Dam, in the Dinosaur National Monument. This dam would destroy the natural beauty of the scenic wild canyons of this monument and would set a dangerous precedent. Millions of Americans are relying on you to take the Echo Park Dam out of this bill and thus protect the national park system from invasion by dams.

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Washington Representative,
Council of Conservationists.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not a particularly pleasant task for a freshman Senator, who has been a Member of this body for less than 4 months, to oppose his views to those of such distinguished Members as the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and many other outstanding Members of this body. However, this is a stand which means a great deal to me. It was a part of my general philosophy long before I entered politics. My wife and I share it together. If anyone will take the trouble to do so—although I am sure no one will, because people have more urgent things to do—he could see many

articles, listed in Readers' Guides, which I have written, and which have been published in leading periodicals, setting forth the definite conviction that there should be no commercial development—whether by private industry or by the Federal Government or by any other unit of government—in our national parks or national monuments. I have adhered to that philosophy, whether it affects the regions represented by other Senators or whether it affects the region I represent, as a United States Senator from the State of Oregon.

PROJECT SUPPORTED IN GENERAL—SAVE FOR ECHO PARK

Mr. President, I have tried to be fair about this matter. When I made the motion that the Echo Park proposal be eliminated from the pending bill—which motion I made as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—I did not do so in opposition to the entire upper Colorado storage project. Indeed, my name is signed to the majority report; it is signed as one of the supporters of that project. My dissent applies only to Echo Park. I think the other Senators know that; and I have made that position abundantly clear, not only here today, but also in speeches and writings which have taken place off the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. President, I say to the Senators who are supporting the upper Colorado project that I urge upon them this position: Some day, perhaps, as our vast Nation develops, not only in the intermountain region, but everywhere else, it may be necessary to flood the Dinosaur National Monument, in order to obtain kilowatts costing even 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, and to get water storage. It may even be necessary to cut down the trees in the Olympic National Park, if we then have come to the end of our timber supply everywhere else. It may be necessary to flood out the Lochsa Wilderness area and the Selway Wilderness area, and to flood out Glacier National Park. It may be necessary to take water from Yellowstone Lake to irrigate land when we are near the end of our food supply, as the Senator from New Mexico prophesies might happen some day. I agree with him that despite our present food surplus, this eventually could occur, as this vast Nation increases so rapidly in population. But I say to Senators who are sponsoring the upper Colorado project, "Do this last, when every other single kilowatt has been developed, when every other canyon which can be filled with water has been filled with water. Develop Echo Park at the very last. Wait until the end of all our other resources to flood out this magnificent scenic area and to breach our national park system." I say that to Senators, just as I have said to those in the lumber industry in the Northwest—and the lumber industry is still the basic industry in my region—"When every other tree has been felled and there is not another stick of timber left, then cut down the trees in the Olympic National Park, but not one day before then."

So I announce in conclusion that it is my very firm belief that the Senate

should pass Senate bill 500, providing for the upper Colorado storage project, but that we definitely should eliminate the authorization for Echo Park Dam in order to preserve the integrity of our national park system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss some of the economic implications and aspects of the pending legislation.

It is fair to say that in my judgment the economic and financial feasibility of the program proposed by S. 500 is open to serious question. Even the limited plan of development recommended by the Interior Department has been challenged on the ground it would require a tremendous subsidy in the form of interest payments added to the national debt. The justifications for the more ambitious and comprehensive plan embodied in the bill, by reason of the amendments recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are even more difficult to accept.

The findings of feasibility are achieved by a very novel approach to the problem of reclamation projects.

The novel bookkeeping used to justify the projects in this bill acknowledges that the agricultural lands to be served by the participating projects cannot bear the costs that would have to be charged if the established repayment formula for irrigation projects should be applied. This is true even in the case of the 11 new participating projects recommended by the Reclamation Bureau. It is even more true as regards the 22 other units the committee saw fit to add.

The Interior Department figures show that \$164,702,600 of the construction cost of \$304,356,000 for the participating projects it proposed would be repaid by revenues from sale of power generated at the six main dams. The dependence upon sale of hydroelectric-energy is even more pronounced when the projects added by the committee are examined. The 22 additional units would cost \$569,925,800. Irrigation water users would repay only \$73,165,700 and \$492,983,300 of the reimbursable outlay is expected to come from power revenues.

This means that if the Federal Treasury ever is reimbursed for the repayable portion of the outlay of \$874,281,800 for the 33 participating projects contemplated by this bill it will have to collect \$657,685,900 through sale of electricity. The repayment by agricultural water users would be less than one-eighth of the expenditure to build the works which would put water on their land.

Two of the participating projects would provide municipal and industrial water. From these, San Juan-Chama and Central Utah, the repayments would be increased by an estimated \$72,275,000. Even including this figure, the total return by water users would be only \$180,487,200 toward an investment of \$874,281,800, or less than 22 percent.

The percentage of cost to be repaid by irrigators varies amazingly. It ranges from 1 percent in the case of the Ohio Creek unit, estimated to cost \$3,402,000, to 100 percent for the small Woody

Creek unit, which would require an outlay of merely \$177,700.

The repayment by water users ought to be vital to consideration of this legislation. Federal money is being sought on the grounds these projects will carry out the principles and aims of the Reclamation Law of 1902. The analysis demonstrates that the repayment ability of the irrigators on the 22 units added by the committee is only 13.8 percent overall.

Another test of financial soundness is the actual cost of putting water on the lands to be served. For the 22 projects added by the committee this figure is \$680 per acre just to get water where it can be used. For the 11 more carefully surveyed and planned units recommended by the Interior Department, the cost would be \$410 per acre. There is a question whether an average cost of \$545 to get water to land where irrigators can repay such small fractions is an economically feasible expenditure.

The participating projects can be justified only by using a rubber yardstick. The construction cost in terms of land to be served ranges from \$60 per acre on the Woody Creek unit to \$1,530 per acre on the Navajo unit.

Uncertainty about economic feasibility extends beyond the participating projects. The soundness of some of the major storage dams and hydroelectric plants can be questioned on the basis of Interior Department reports.

I recall, for example, that during the hearings some discussion occurred with respect to the background of Glen Canyon, and the feasibility of that particular project. On page 108 of the hearings on Senate bill 500 I quoted from a letter which the present Secretary of the Interior had written to a citizen of my State. I wish now to quote from that letter. The Secretary wrote:

"MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of September 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

"It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are underway by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time."

On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted

grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or 60 feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

Mr. President, some of us on the committee, who are admittedly not experts in the technical and professional fields, assuredly possess the right to have some concern when the Secretary of the Interior indicates in a letter that his professional advisers feel some anxiety with respect to one of the major projects involved in the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, let me cite, as an instance, the Curecanti project. That is one of the key structures to be built only after plans are reviewed by the Department, and after the Secretary has certified to Congress and the President that he is convinced the benefits will exceed the costs.

The Reclamation Bureau report on the Curecanti unit, according to the printed hearings, says that "detailed studies are necessary to refine the economic scale of development and to confirm the present reconnaissance appraisal."

Another major structure to be built only after further investigation is similarly doubtful as to feasibility. This is the Juniper Dam, which the committee substituted for the original proposal to build a major structure and powerplant at Cross Mountain. The Reclamation Bureau told the committee that the combined Juniper and Little Cross Mountain units would be "less attractive for power development than the large single Cross Mountain unit" which was dropped from the original plan.

Another question can be raised about Juniper. The Reclamation Bureau has failed to come up with any estimate of revenues from the Juniper powerplant, although it includes in the cost figures an item of \$4,584,000 for generating equipment, and another of \$1,250,000 for transmission lines, and says the hydroelectric output will be 125 million kilowatt-hours annually. Apparently the Interior Department has some reservations about the marketability of the power from this plant.

Mr. President, again I wish to refer to the hearings before the committee, at page 232. Forty lines of type are de-

voted to a description of the Juniper project, upon which there is no kind of feasibility report whatever.

There is considerable doubt whether the demand for energy from the six big units will be as great as sponsors of the development believe will be the case. Since the feasibility of the whole program depends so much on power revenues, I want to point out that the record made by the Interior Committee does little to remove this uncertainty whether the sales will bring in the tremendous amounts expected, or the \$1,566,838,200 shown in Bureau reports as prospective income from power sales.

The price which will be charged for energy from these units will be 6 mills per kilowatt hour. This hardly can be called low-cost power, when compared with rates of 2 mills for Hoover Dam power and 2.5 mills for Columbia Basin power. The Reclamation Bureau acknowledges that in two cases, Curecanti and Flaming Gorge, "a power rate of more than 6 mills would be required for these units to repay their construction cost in 50 years at 2.5 percent interest."

The difference between the financing proposed for the Upper Colorado River project and the first development in the Lower Basin, Hoover Dam, is startling. Before any work was started on Hoover Dam, firm contracts had been negotiated for sale of power. The private utilities operating in the Upper Basin have told the committee merely that they are ready to take large blocks providing the price is right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I would prefer not to yield until I have concluded my remarks, which will be within 3 or 4 minutes.

On the question of feasibility, I want to point out that according to the principal spokesman for the upper basin utility companies water is needed more than power. In addition, according to this witness before the committee, the market is much thinner, with only an average of 3 persons per square mile as compared with a national population density of 51.

David Moffatt, vice president of Utah Power & Light Co., testified that the upper basin is "one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world. The potential thermal power resources of this area stagger the imagination." He qualified his offer to take large blocks of power by saying the energy must be "reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs."

On this point, I quote from page 312 of the hearings, Mr. Moffatt testified:

We believe that the financial feasibility of the project depends upon the sale to private utilities of the power output of the project plants not contracted for by such customers as may be entitled to preference and that such sales should be made at the powerplants or along the backbone transmission tie line upon terms such as that the cost of project power will not exceed the cost of power from alternate sources.

The proponents of the bill maintain there is an assured market for the hydro-

electricity to be produced. Yet Mr. Moffatt said:

We are willing to buy the entire output provided the plants are put in on a schedule in consonance with the load requirements of the area. If too many of the units were put in at one time, of course, we could not contract to buy all of that at one time.

Furthermore, Mr. Moffatt said in response to an inquiry that no tentative contracts have been worked out and the companies have only discussed prospective purchases with the Interior Department.

The doubts about economic feasibility as it relates to power revenues can be illustrated by a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Moffatt. He told the committee:

Electric power from this project is not a necessity; it can be used and that is our principle for cooperation. * * * I do wish to reemphasize that what we need in our area is water.

Since the construction of these dams might undermine the financial structure of the existing lower basin projects, I must emphasize the contrast between the conditions which preceded building of Hoover Dam and those in which the projects proposed in this bill might be constructed. I will quote the testimony of Ben Griffith, president of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles. He told the committee:

California * * * succeeded in obtaining congressional approval of the Boulder Canyon project. But not, it must be noted, until the city of Los Angeles, through its department of water and power, and other California agencies, had underwritten the entire cost of its construction by obligating itself to purchase the energy generated at such a price as would amortize the Government's investment and pay 4—later reduced to 3—percent interest.

There are a few other items of testimony that are of minor significance but have the effect of heightening uneasiness about statements this program is economically feasible. I wish to cite some statements from Reclamation Bureau reports. According to the hearings, it is assumed that sufficient water can be made available to supply higher lands in the Grand Mesa project but if this assumption is wrong the development could be "considerably less desirable economically than indicated."

Bureau admitted that payments by water users on Tomichi Creek will not be sufficient to pay operation and maintenance costs and replacement. The plans for the Eagle Divide unit may need to be modified "to provide the greatest degree of economic justification." These comments relate to projects we are being asked to approve with a condition that before any work is done they will be brought back to Congress for further authorization.

Of the 39 separate works enumerated in this bill, formal feasibility reports exist only for 14 at this stage. There is 1 partial report on 2 units and a report subject to review on a 17th. In the light of these facts, it is exceedingly difficult to see how the sponsors of this program can

maintain as they do on page 13 of the majority report that "the Colorado River storage project and participating projects plan is financially sound."

Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, and wish to repeat today, as a Member of the United States Senate I desire to cast my vote in favor of proposed legislation which will be of benefit to the States in the upper Colorado River Basin, and, indeed, to the benefit of all the States of the American Union, but I think I have a duty to recall that when we dealt with problems concerning Hoover Dam, we followed one yardstick and made the people of that area guarantee in advance that they would reimburse the Government of the United States for all costs, and I think I have a duty to point out that a different yardstick has been followed in this instance. It seems to me that the Department of the Interior ought to give the Senate committee and the Members of the Senate a complete feasibility report upon the project, and that we should follow with reference to this proposed legislation exactly the practice followed in days gone by, and on that basis, not in advance of a departmental determination of feasibility, the Congress could then proceed in an orderly fashion and determine on the merits of the report whether we should pass authorizing legislation.

Mr. President, those are some of the views which I wished to present today; and in view of the comments I made yesterday and today, I shall tomorrow offer some amendments to the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I had expected to ask to be recognized at this time, but I yield that privilege to my senior colleague.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has told me that he has a very short statement he wishes to make at this time, and I should like to extend him that courtesy if, by unanimous consent, I shall not lose my place on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, at the outset, let me thank the Senator from Utah for his kindness in yielding at this time. It so happens that I have an engagement early this evening and it is necessary for me to leave the floor very shortly.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that the REA's in my State are finding themselves in great difficulty in obtaining sufficient power to satisfy their needs. As a matter of fact, two groups of REA's, one in the southeastern section of my State and another in the northeastern section, are presently endeavoring to obtain a loan for a plant to generate electricity so they can have available a sufficient volume to meet the needs of their subscribers. In both cases they are required to pay an amount in excess of that quoted by the distinguished junior Senator from California. So I have no reason to doubt the veracity of the statement furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation that power com-

panies in the upper Colorado River Basin area will take all the power which can be produced at the various sites involved in the project.

Mr. President, the great State of Wyoming falls like a saddle astride the top of the Continental Divide. We are blessed with an abundance of water. It flows from our mountains in all directions. The snow that is packed on our mountain tops in the wintertime and the rain that falls on the hills of Wyoming in the summertime contribute tremendously to the welfare of each of our neighboring States. Sometimes our water comes down in a soft and gentle fashion for the accommodation of man, and at other times it rushes down in terrific torrents and wreaks destruction, devastation, and death on its march to the sea.

The Colorado River rises high in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, and its major tributary, the Green River, rises in the high mountains of Wyoming. These mountain streams are formed on that pyramid which forms the backbone of North America. The Colorado River cuts deeply into the living rock, gouging out literally thousands of spectacular canyons.

Water, when controlled, can be one of man's greatest assets, yet when uncontrolled, it can be a terrifying liability of devastating force. Congress long ago determined to do something about our water problem. And so it was, Mr. President, that Congress in its wisdom set up some very definite water policies. The Congress determined to control the water where there was too much, and to save and conserve it where there was too little. The twin programs of flood control and reclamation have been the accepted policy of the country for many years. In the long run probably as much money has been spent for one as the other. Both are sound policies in the public interest.

Reclamation is the cornerstone upon which the hopes and the aspirations of our Mountain States are built. It is the hallmark upon which our progress is based. The growth of the western empire depends largely upon the wise use of our water resources. We want to make water serve as many masters as possible and to use it time after time. We want to use it to produce power not once but many times.

About \$2.4 billion has been spent on Federal reclamation projects in the 17 Western States in the last half century. But, Mr. President, the crops produced on these lands have brought to the farmers over \$8 billion. Reclamation has poured thousands of dollars into the pockets of not only the farmers, businessmen, and manufacturers, but also large sums in the form of taxes into county, State, and national treasuries. In 1952 nearly 7 million irrigable acres under Federal reclamation works produced a little less than a billion dollars worth of crops. Our reclamation States have been helped immeasurably by the new wealth created by these projects. The tax base has been broadened and our economy has been placed on a sound basis. The irrigated farms of the West

produce crops that do not compete to any large extent with crops grown elsewhere in the country. The steadily expanding population of the West has created a market not only for its own agricultural products but those grown in other areas. Some people may say that we have more irrigated lands than the country needs. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the 5½ million acres of irrigated lands only offset our losses in farmlands through soil erosion and depletion.

Federal tax revenues since 1916 from Federal reclamation areas now stand at more than \$3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all our federally constructed projects to date.

The construction of the upper Colorado River project will signal the development of the last big water hole in the mountain west. The Colorado River compact, negotiated nearly a third of a century ago, is now known as "the law of the river." Under it the upper States are bound to deliver to the lower States at Lee Ferry 75 million acre-feet in continuing 10-year periods. There is the sticker. The upper States cannot deliver the water unless dams are built to conserve and store floodwaters in wet years so that delivery of water to the lower States can be made during dry years. And another thing, big dams and powerplants must be constructed on the main stem of the river to supply badly needed power which, in turn, will produce the revenue to make the project pay out.

Mr. President, we are here today knocking at the door of Congress with a plan of action looking toward the development of the immense water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin States. The project is sound and feasible. By and large, Mr. President, the passage of this bill will serve as a guarantee to the people of these sovereign States that they will not be deprived of their heritage to use the waters bestowed upon them by a beneficent creator. It will serve as an insurance policy protecting them against the loss of the right to use their rightful share of their own water.

The Colorado River storage project consists of a team of dams, reservoirs, and powerplants to be constructed in conformance with the compacts and the Mexican Treaty. The bill would authorize storage units at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo, and Flaming Gorge.

The Flaming Gorge Dam would be a concrete structure 440 feet high, costing \$82 million. It would store 3,940,000 acre-feet of water and would produce 72,000 kilowatts of power. That dam would be located 2 miles south of the Wyoming line just above the junction of the Green River and Henry's Fork in Utah. The reservoir behind Flaming Gorge Dam would back up the water to within 3 miles of Green River in my State.

I can say to my distinguished friend from California that all the power will be needed and used very readily in the

towns of Green River and Rock Springs, in my State.

The 12 initial participating projects also authorized are supported by reports showing their economic and engineering feasibility. Except for approximately 3 percent allocated to recreation the upper Colorado River storage project is self-liquidating. The costs assigned to power features will be repaid, with interest, in less than 50 years. The costs assigned to irrigation will be repaid, without interest, by the water users within their ability to repay and the balance will be repaid out of power revenues.

Now, Mr. President, let me take a few moments to mention the Wyoming projects. Under the 1948 compact, Wyoming was allotted 1,043,000 acre-feet of water each year. Wyoming now uses about 248,000 acre-feet, and thus 795,000 acre-feet will be available for new uses each year.

As previously mentioned, the participating projects in our State are the Seedskaadee, Lyman, and LaBarge. A fourth project, the Eden project, was authorized in 1940 and is now under construction.

The Seedskaadee project, largest of the Wyoming group, is located about 35 miles east of Kemmerer. It will irrigate more than 60,000 acres of virgin land located along both sides of the Green River between the mouth of Fontenelle Creek and the town of Green River. The Seedskaadee project appears to present the best opportunity for a substantial development of new land in southwestern Wyoming, if not in the whole upper Colorado River Basin.

The LaBarge project includes approximately 7,600 acres of land that will be irrigated by diverting flows of the Green River at a point between Big Piney and LaBarge.

The Lyman project would provide supplemental water for irrigation of approximately 40,000 acres of land along Blacks Fork, now badly in need of late season water. The type of farming on Wyoming's participating projects is limited by climatic conditions. Because of relatively high altitudes, the crops grown will be largely forage and small grains. The construction of these four participating Wyoming units will bring water to 79,390 acres of land for the first time, and supplemental water to 49,900 acres presently under irrigation. The Eden project, north of Rock Springs, involves construction of a 40,000 acre-foot storage reservoir on the Big Sandy and will impound 40,000 acre-feet of water and will irrigate 10,660 acres of new land and supply water for nearly that much more of irrigated lands.

Mr. President, I was very pleased to see the Sublette and Savery-Pot Hook added as additional participating projects with construction to commence when feasibility reports are made and authorization by the Congress is obtained. The Sublette project is located in Sublette County. It will provide water for 72,000 acres of new lands and supplemental water for 12,000 acres of presently irrigated lands. The lands are located along the Green and New Fork Rivers. The project includes three res-

ervoirs, namely, Kendall, Burnt Lake, and Boulder Lake, and a 2,200 kilowatt powerplant.

Kendall Reservoir site is located about 100 miles upstream from the Seedska-dee project lands. Studies of development possibilities of the Kendall Reservoir have disclosed that a revised plan can be developed for the Seedska-dee project which would give a greater economic utilization of the available land and water resources. By providing storage at Kendall Reservoir, site some 15,810 acres of additional land in the Seedska-dee project area can be served.

By using surplus flows of streams in the Little Snake River, the Savery-Pot Hook project will provide additional water for 13,000 acres presently irrigated and water for 18,000 acres of new lands. The project lands are near the Colorado-Wyoming line and located in both States.

Mr. President, in the long run the yardstick by which you can measure the growth and development of our section of the country is in the amount of water that can be and is applied to our dry lands and, secondly, the volume of power that can be generated for use by industries now located in the area and that may be attracted to our country.

It is true that this is a large project. Certainly it will cost a lot of money, but it will be under construction for more than a quarter of a century, with the appropriations spread over a long period of time. More important, Mr. President, it will pay its own way.

By building this project the people in other sections of the country will, in the long run, pay less rather than more taxes. Thousands upon thousands of new taxpayers who will produce new wealth from the soil of this great valley, year after year, will be added to the tax rolls and will bear their full share of the tax burden. We believe in the Christian precept of "live and let live."

Mr. President, this project has the approval of the Bureau of Reclamation, of the Secretary of the Interior and of the President himself. Mr. President, simple justice demands the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I attempted to interrupt the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] when he was speaking a few minutes ago about the requirements with respect to contracts and guaranties which were met before Hoover Dam was built.

After some 14 years of experience in working with the reclamation program before I came to Congress, while representing a group of water users, not the United States, I had some opportunity to observe what the United States actually requires before projects are constructed.

We are now at the authorization stage; we are not asking for appropriations at this moment. If the Bureau of Reclamation follows its usual practice, this is what will likely happen: A project may be authorized, and then appropriations will be made and contracts entered into before the project itself will be allowed to go forward. I refer to all the kinds of contracts which are neces-

sary to insure the repayment of the costs of the construction program.

That is precisely what happened in the case of the Provo River project, which I represented as general counsel. All contracts governing the repayment of the entire cost of that project had to be entered into, signed, properly executed, and approved by the Department of the Interior before one shovel full of dirt could be turned in connection with the construction of the project.

What the Senator from California said was that before the construction of a project in California could proceed it was necessary to enter into a firm and binding guaranty or contract that the costs of the project would be repaid. That is the usual practice. What was being argued, apparently, was that Congress might not proceed with an authorization before contracts were made. I have never heard of a case in which a legal, binding contract could be entered into before a project actually was authorized. United States officials never would be permitted to enter into that kind of contract unless firm authority was granted by Congress. So, as to the objection made with respect to that particular requirement on the part of California, there is no reason on earth why that case was any different from the case we are now considering.

Before Glen Canyon and the other projects can be built, it will be necessary to have definite, concrete, final checks on everything. As to all the participating projects, it will be necessary to have some sort of guaranty or contract for repayment.

Thus, as to storage and power projects on the main stem of the river, much has been learned from the past. Hoover Dam was the first of the great dams to be built. Since that time it has been demonstrated beyond any doubt that there is a power market, and that all the power can be sold. Today there is no longer the gamble that there was in the days when Hoover Dam was authorized. In those days there was much doubt expressed whether the cost of construction ever could be repaid. It was said that the cost was too large; that there would be too much power produced; that there would be no market for the power.

Of course, the Government was then embarking upon a pioneer project and wanted to be secured. Before construction began, after the authorization, it was necessary that there be contracts. That will be the case with respect to the upper Colorado project. I take it for granted that the United States will require the utilities, including the REA's and the other public agencies, who are preference customers, to have contracts for the purchase of power before the dams are actually built.

Under the program the building of the dams is not to proceed with all of them at once. They are to be developed in accordance with the report which I believe has been submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

The development under the program will go forward, as the engineers have planned, with the construction, first, of Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams.

Those dams will have to be built in advance, in order to bring about the filling of the reservoirs with surplus waters. Those reservoirs, it has been estimated, could have been easily filled in past years with surplus water which has been wasted by being allowed to flow into the Gulf of California.

Since a number of years will be required for the filling of the reservoirs once the dams have been constructed, it is important to have that program move ahead; and for that reason Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams will be the first to be built.

After those dams have been constructed, power operations can begin, and the consumers will be able to take the power, thus enabling that program to go forward.

At the same time, some of the smaller participating projects may be started. The Emery project, in eastern Utah, can be begun, as can the Central Utah project. Projects in Wyoming and Colorado can be started, and in New Mexico the building of the Navaho project can proceed.

This is a program which will not call for construction all at once. That point should be kept in mind. This is a program for the future. In my judgment, it will take at least 10 years to build the big dams. My judgment is based on the experience I have had with the Reclamation Bureau and other agencies. Some of the smaller projects can be gotten under way and be finished a little sooner; but the demands upon the Treasury will not be for huge sums in any single year. Construction will be started and will proceed over the years until the final program has been consummated. This may take all the way from 35 years to, I should say, based upon my experience, 50 years.

When the total cost is divided among 4 States, possibly 5, the money which will be appropriated will not be very much per State over that period of time.

All that is necessary to be done, to ascertain how the proposed project will compare with others, is to consider California and note the number of reclamation developments which have been made in the Central Valley, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and in the other sections of the State.

I have been very much in favor of those national investments, although they run into huge sums. I point out to the distinguished junior Senator from California that in the case of the Central Valley projects, there were no contracts of any kind for the repayment of any of the costs before the great dams were built. Those dams were built during the depression; they were started in a hurry. Some of them were begun by the Army engineers and later were turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation to operate. The Bureau went ahead without having contracts for repayment of or guarantee of the construction costs. They do not have contracts even today for the repayment of the costs of that great project.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is acquainted with the fact, is he not, that the people of California approved legislation to have themselves build the Central Valley projects?

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean to buy it?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, sir; to build it. The State legislature of my State enacted legislation to provide for the construction of the Central Valley projects and thereafter, at a referendum election, the people of my State approved the Central Valley legislation, and subsequent to that time, during the depression days, it is true, as the Senator suggests, the Federal Government, of its own motion or ipse dixit, came in and built the Central Valley projects.

Mr. WATKINS. I remember all of that history, but the fact is that California did not go ahead with the construction, and the United States did not require contracts before the construction was started. It is one of the most costly projects in the history of reclamation. The Army engineers also had a hand in its construction.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Utah is my good friend, and he is an able and honorable Member of this body. I do, however, want to suggest, with respect to the Central Valleys project, that, from the standpoint of economic feasibility, it is one of the soundest projects in this country. I have figures, which I shall subsequently ask to have printed in the RECORD, which the Department of the Interior prepared.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to say that the upper Colorado River project is one of the soundest in the country, and probably has been studied more closely than has any other project in the history of the United States. The project will be expensive, and that is one reason why there had to be such extensive study of it. Nature was not so kind to us as it was to the people of Southern California.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. If I understood his statement correctly, it was to the effect that the upper Colorado River project will be paid for by 4 or 5 States. Did I understand correctly?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. The States in which the actual participating projects will be located are Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. One of the storage dams on the main stem of the river will be in a fifth State, Arizona. Of course, we count in the area the State of Nevada, which is close by, with respect to the purchase of power.

Mr. BIBLE. It was the purpose of my question to determine the Senator's thinking as to the sale of power from Glen Canyon. Would the Senator care

to elaborate as to whom the power which will be developed at Glen Canyon, which will be the largest of the dams to be constructed in the upper Colorado River, would be sold?

Mr. WATKINS. First I should like to say there are the 4 States I have just mentioned, the upper basin States. Secondly, Nevada is in the area, and there undoubtedly will be power to sell for a long period of time before Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams will be constructed in Arizona, which will be even nearer to Nevada. There is not any doubt that the people of Nevada will be able to obtain power from the project.

Mr. BIBLE. How will that be determined?

Mr. WATKINS. By the Bureau of Reclamation, which will have charge of the operation of the dams.

Mr. BIBLE. Can the Senator indicate the power rate?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Bureau of Reclamation will be required to get from the customers downstream the same rate it will get from the customers upstream, within the basin States. That will be about 6 mills delivered at the load center; that is, at the market center. Of course, there can be no absolute guaranty of that until the authorization and the construction, but the testimony was that 6 mills will be the approximate market price of the power at the load center.

Mr. BIBLE. Would the Senator care to indicate the duration of the contracts the Secretary would enter into with the public agencies involved?

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot answer that, because I cannot speak for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Government which will be operating the power plants. All I can say is that I have a very strong feeling and belief that no one in that area will be deprived of power before there is other power provided to take its place. If the power should be required in the upper basin, it will never be taken away unless there is other power to take its place.

As the Senator knows, there are other big developments contemplated on the Colorado, at Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon. Even if the project at Bridge Canyon alone were to be built, it would furnish an immense amount of power, which would be easier to transmit to Nevada users.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Am I correct in understanding that the cost at the load center will be somewhere between 4.2 and 4.7 mills?

Mr. WATKINS. I understood the engineers arrived at a figure in that neighborhood. I think I know what the Senator has in mind. The situation is very much like that which would obtain in a power company with a half dozen plants. It might have plant A, which would produce power at a certain cost; plant B, which would produce power at a different cost; and perhaps two or three of the plants in its system would produce at rather high cost, but all the power would be sold at one rate. The power would

probably be sold at the same rate. In other words, all the power should be pooled and should be sold at one established rate.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator yield for a further question along that line?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. It is my understanding that Glen Canyon will be the first of the projects to be completed, or among the first, as now planned.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it will probably be the first. If not the first, it will be completed at about the same time as Echo Park, if that project should be authorized.

Mr. BIBLE. Between the time Glen Canyon is completed and other dams are completed, will there be the same differential in power cost?

Mr. WATKINS. I think so, because the projects were planned on a comprehensive basis. It was impossible to consider only one unit and say it would be built according to certain costs and standards and say that others would be built under another plan.

Let us get back to the planning work with which the Bureau of Reclamation was confronted. It was a very difficult project to get the water out of the deep canyons, store it, and find some economically feasible way in which it could be used and paid for. So the program had to be operated as one, and the States had to cooperate in order to get a program which would be feasible. We could not plan as has been planned in other projects where the problems were not so difficult, and in which one project could be proposed at a time and completed. We have had to present the whole program, which would take into consideration the highest cost and the lowest cost, and arrive at a feasible program. I do not know what the Bureau which will operate the dams will do. I cannot commit it, as I think the Senator understands.

Mr. BIBLE. I understand.

Mr. WATKINS. I should say the theory would be that even in the beginning the power must be sold at about 6 mills in order that the program may work out.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that aspect of the question. I know he has a great interest in the project, and that he is watching and following the debate with an eye to the welfare of his State.

I firmly hope we may make plain to the people of the entire Colorado River system the fact that there is only one way we can succeed in building the projects out of the resources which God has given us, and that is to cooperate, to live and let live, as my distinguished friend suggested a while ago.

Mr. President, that brings me to the matter of cooperation in the building of these great projects. I have mentioned the difficulties we have in the upper Colorado. The canyons are deep. There is a steep gradient. Not only is it necessary to build one large storage dam, such as the one that was built at Boulder Canyon, known as Hoover Dam, but it is

also necessary to build others. We have to build nine, as I understand, in the beginning, in order to completely regulate and tame that river and store the water which must be used for consumptive purposes in the lower basin States and in the upper basin States. All that must be done before we can really get anywhere with the program. We must tame and regulate the river. That is one of the big problems we have.

By examining the map which has been placed in the rear of the Chamber—a map published by the Bureau of Reclamation, and bearing the title "Colorado River Storage Project and Supporting Projects"—it will be seen that we have, by means of the map, a portrayal of the situation in that area. The Uinta Mountains cross the area. There are a number of streams, beginning with the Strawberry River, which runs into the Duchesne, the Rock Creek, the Lake Fork, the Uinta, and the Ashley Creek, all of which flow into the Green River. Those streams are fed by snows which fall in the winter on that high mountain range which runs east and west, by the way. It does not have sharp peaks and ridges, as does the Wasatch Range, which runs north and south through Utah. But it is a natural watershed. On the north, the water runs into Wyoming. On the east slope, the water runs into Colorado. The water runs into the Green River, from the various short tributaries which come from the mountains.

In order to give to the States in the lower basin the amount of water the compact calls for, it is necessary to build these storage dams. That statement has been repeated so many times that it should now be well established.

The reason for building the storage dams, largely for irrigation purposes, has not been sufficiently emphasized. The water users in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming must take their water from the higher tributaries of the Colorado River; and before they can take the water, they must be sure that the commitments to the lower-basin States will be fulfilled. In order to do that, it is necessary to build the large dams, such as the one at Glen Canyon. The dam will be built below the Utah border, just above Lee's Ferry. Then, going up into the basin, we have the Echo Park, the Flaming Gorge, just over the Utah boundary from Wyoming; and then the Juniper, which was substituted for the Cross Mountain; and the Navaho, in New Mexico, all of which are shown on the map.

When the water is taken from the smaller streams, it will have to be stored again, because the water falls in the wintertime in the form of snow. Some rain falls on those mountains, and seeps into the ground, and comes up later as springs; but the major runoff occurs at the time of the year when very little water can be used for irrigation purposes. The water runs down the steep mountain slopes and the steep canyons and the streams with heavy gradients, and flows into the Green River, and thus down into the Gulf of Southern California. It is necessary to store the water which is in the tributaries. We have to

have secondary storage there, in order to hold the water until the time when it is needed.

The big dams on the main Colorado require holdover storage. That is a term which many persons, including some Members of Congress, do not understand, I am sure. Holdover storage means holding over from year to year, from the wet cycle of years to the dry cycle of years, a supply of water sufficient to take care of the needs during the droughts which occur at times. As history shows, there will be a series of wet years, and then a series of dry years. During the dry cycle, the Colorado River becomes a very small stream; and in its natural condition, before any reservoirs at all were built, there was hardly enough water in the Colorado during the dry cycle or the so-called low-water season, to take care of the commitments to the farms and other areas downstream, which had commitments and priorities by means of early use of the water of that stream.

After Hoover Dam was built, the lower river was regulated; and, of course, that made it possible for the users downstream to obtain a sufficient supply of water. But it did not regulate the water upstream.

By means of a series of exchanges, we can take the water from the dams we build downstream, below where we make our diversions, and send it down for use in the lower basin States; and then we can take a corresponding amount of water out of the tributaries in the higher streams or mountain valleys, and use it on our lands. That is a common practice at present in the West, namely, the exchange of waters. It is about the only way by which we can make such a project work satisfactorily.

Awhile ago I stated that cooperation is one of our greatest programs in the West. When the pioneers first went into that area, they came into the valleys where small streams were running across the land—for instance, in Utah, to the great Salt Lake. They decided to take out the water, because the land was barren. Instead of having each one take water through his own canal or ditch, leading directly from the stream, they decided to take the water from one canal, with each to take the water in his turn, as the canal passed through or around his land. That meant that the man at the end of the canal would have to pay—if the same system of economics was followed—more than anyone else would pay, because it would cost more to bring the water to his end of the canal than it would cost to bring the water to the land owned by those who would first take water from the canal. They soon found that those who had the advantage of being at the head of the canal, and who would take out the water a short time after it left the rivers or streams, would have to cooperate with the others, and would have to pay an equal part of the cost of taking the water from the stream through the ditch. That is where we learned about cooperation.

I know that at times, strong individuals decided they would take what they wanted from the streams. But if every

farmer had done that, there would have been a whole series of canals which would have cut up the land to so great an extent that it would not have been usable. Moreover, enormous amounts of water would have been wasted. The necessities of the situation forced cooperation.

We have followed cooperation, now, and have applied it to the large projects. Today, the States are cooperating in very much the same fashion in which the farmers cooperated in the early times, in connection with the development of their communities. That is an excellent thing. We have combined the resources, and we have planned to pool the water resources which come into full development in the large dams on the main stem; and even in central Utah there is a power situation which can be developed and will go into the common pool.

At any rate, we take the total income from the sale of water and the sale of power, and put the total income into one pool, and from it pay for the cost of the project. We even form local entities known as conservancy districts, which bring into the picture even those who do not use water for irrigation. That situation or system exists at the present time. For instance, in the Weber Basin project, in north-central Utah, a conservancy district has been formed; and it brings in the cities, counties, towns, and irrigation companies. The irrigation companies pay, through assessments; but the districts and towns pay for their water; and even the counties which do not use water from the project will levy and pay taxes to help the project, on the theory that everyone who benefits directly or indirectly from the water, should help pay for it.

So the program is, with respect to all these participating projects, to have the conservancy type of organization provided, so that the contracts will be with the communities, the cities, counties, and town governments, and the taxpayers generally, as well as those who use the water for specific purposes such as irrigation.

It should also be kept in mind that all the people of the States will get the benefit from the use of the water. Most of the people of the States under modern conditions, use power. In a measure, it is correct to say that it does not make any difference, so far as the people are concerned, whether they are billed for the costs on the basis of all power, all water, or simply "power and water," or "water and power." The same people would largely pay both the water costs and the power costs. Under those circumstances we cannot understand all the concern for the power users of our State. It is said, "Look at the load the power users have to carry for irrigation. They are going to pay a large percentage of the cost of these projects, at least that part which is allocated to irrigation. Why should they do that?"

Why should they not do it, if they are willing to do it? That is exactly the situation. They have considered that situation. They say, "We are willing to help. We need the water. We cannot

get anywhere without water. Power is of no use to us without water. We cannot build industries in our States without water. We need power as well." It so happens that by reason of the combination of the two and the building of the big storage dams to store water primarily so that we can complete our commitments downstream and at the same time have water for irrigation and other important uses, we can also, as an incident thereto, produce great quantities of electric energy.

I wish to say something about a situation which has been described a number of times by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. They say that this is one of the most expensive places to produce power. I will not undertake to argue that point with them. I think actually, when we consider the increases in costs which have occurred in recent years, power can probably be produced as cheaply under this project as it can be produced in some other areas. But after all is said and done, we cannot move, and do not want to move, to the Columbia River Valley. We do not want to move to the Missouri River Valley. We are not anxious to go down to California, even with all the advantages of climate. We want to live where we have established our homes—in our own States. We know that there are vast quantities of raw materials, such as zinc, lead, copper, chemicals, uranium, coal, oil, oil shale, and numerous other minerals and natural resources in that area, which will require a great deal of refining before they can be used. That work can be done only by having an abundant supply of water, an abundant supply of labor, and an abundant supply of power.

We have lived there before, on the basis of paying more than 6 mills for our power. We can still continue to do it, and I believe we can compete with other areas which have cheaper power. It is unfortunate that our power in that area will cost more, but that is the way it is. That is where we want to live. We want the same rules to apply as are applied in other areas of the United States, and we want to receive the same benefits as have been received by other areas of the United States, such as the Columbia River area, southern California, northern California, and other areas. All we ask is that the program be not changed, now that it is our turn to receive some benefits.

Other areas have received large benefits in past years, and the people in those areas now tell us how cheaply they obtained their power. It may make us feel sad because we cannot duplicate their experience upstream. At any rate, we are willing to try. Our record is good. We have been repaying the costs of the smaller projects according to contracts and we know we can do it in connection with the larger program. Four States are involved. Some power will be sold in Nevada, and possibly some in California. We know that under that arrangement, with what we can pay for water and power, we will pay the cost of the entire project and all its units. If need be we can take care of it in the Upper Basin

States. We shall have firm commitments for the purchase of power and for the repayment of costs of participating projects before construction actually is underway. I am sure the Bureau of Reclamation will go ahead with the other program. There will be firm contracts for the purchase of power from powerplants on the main stream, and there will be firm contracts with the conservancy districts for the repayment of other costs, in accordance with the overall program.

I wished to explain that situation, because there has been much misunderstanding. I feel that those who discuss the problem are sincere. There must be a misunderstanding, when they try to make it appear that we cannot carry that burden.

The Bureau of Reclamation—at least, Region 4, with which we are acquainted, and which has developed this program—is one of the most conservative groups of public officials I have ever worked with. I have worked with them for 14 years. I know how conservative they are. They will want contracts before construction begins. They want to be sure that the costs of the projects will be repaid, and that a heavy burden will not be cast upon the rest of the United States.

I have before me a series of questions and answers with respect to specific problems which have been raised in the debate. I know that these questions bother some Members of Congress.

I read:

1. Water supply: Why is the Colorado River so difficult to control and why has its development been so long delayed?

(1) The Colorado is one of the longest rivers in the United States. It drains the most rugged topography. In the upper basin, the canyons along the main stream are so deep that direct divisions are impossible except on the tributaries. Basin-wide development is mandatory because the entire river must be put under control before its waters can be made available for consumptive use at the time they are needed.

2. Why does the river have to be controlled before its waters can be made available for consumptive use?

I have partially answered that question.

(1) The Colorado River is a snow-fed stream.

(2) Its maximum flow occurs during the snow-melting period.

(3) This period of high flow does not coincide with the demand for consumptive use.

(4) The low-water flow occurs during the late summer when the irrigation water requirements are greatest. The high-water flow may be as much as 100 times the low-water flow.

(5) Storage reservoirs are necessary to hold the early runoff from snow melt so that it will be available for late summer use.

(6) The total annual discharge of the Colorado varies widely from year to year. A high year may be as much as six times a low-water year.

(7) In order to fully utilize the entire flow of the river it is necessary to put the water available during wet years into large hold-over storage reservoirs so that it will be available for use during the dry years.

3. What do you mean by consumptive and nonconsumptive uses of water?

Strange as it may seem, some persons are in doubt on that question.

(1) Uses which consume the body of the water such as domestic and irrigation are consumptive uses.

(2) Uses which do not consume the water such as power generation, navigation, recreation, and cooling are nonconsumptive uses.

4. What is the primary objective of the storage portion of the proposed project?

By that I assume is meant the five main stream reservoirs on the Colorado River, the Green, Yampa, Gunnison, Grand, and San Juan, which run into the main stream.

(1) To provide water for consumptive use by direct diversion or by exchange at the time and in the quantities needed to meet the demands for irrigation and other consumptive uses.

(2) Such storage is mandatory in order that the wet season flow may be held over to the dry season and the flow during wet years held over to meet the consumptive use demands during the dry years.

(3) Regulation of the river flow by storage is also necessary to insure delivery of water to the lower basin to meet the requirements of the Colorado River compact and at the same time permit the consumptive uses apportioned to the upper basin by the same compact.

5. How can the storage of water in Glen Canyon and Echo Park reservoirs, for example, supply water for consumptive use in the upper basin participating projects?

(1) Water may be used by direct diversion out of Echo reservoir by pumping, to replace water owned by lower users in Utah which is intercepted on the high tributaries in the Uinta mountains for diversion by gravity to the Bonneville Basin.

That fact has not been sufficiently emphasized in connection with the Echo Park project. Echo Park is tied in intimately with the use of the Central Utah project, at least in its advanced stages, although perhaps not in its initial stages. If we take water from the Uinta Mountains, which runs into streams which flow into the Colorado River, we must have water to supply to the present users of the waters of the tributaries in that basin. In order to do that, probably it will be necessary to take water out of Echo, and it may have to be necessary to pump it from Echo.

Two alternate programs have been suggested. One is to bring in water through a tunnel from Flaming Gorge. The other is to take it out of Echo. It may be that when the final program is set up it will be found to be cheaper to take it out of Echo by pumping it.

That is one of the strong reasons why Echo is necessary to irrigation. All of these dams would be built for the primary purpose of the consumptive use of water. Otherwise we could not consume the water from the other stream, because it would run into the Colorado River and on down below to satisfy the rights of the people there.

(2) Water out of Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs will be used to replace water diverted to the participating projects from the high tributaries of the Colorado, which water during periods of low flow before regulation belonged to water users in the lower basin.

(3) Therefore, water out of the storage reservoirs in the upper basin will be used consumptively, by exchange, for irrigation, domestic, and industrial uses.

6. It has been said that the proposed project is a power project and that the produc-

tion of power is the primary objective. Where does power fit into this program?

(1) Power is an incident, and a very important incident, in the proposed project, but not the primary objective.

(2) It is energy resulting from water, falling from the high watersheds to the valley floor.

(3) This energy is made available at the storage dams which provide river regulation and water for consumptive use.

(4) It would be a gross waste of a resource not to use it. Furthermore, this energy resource will provide revenues, not only to pay for power features with interest, but to help pay the costs of the participating irrigation projects.

(5) Summarizing, the proposed storage project will:

(a) Provide water, controlled and regulated, for consumptive use in the upper basin States without interfering in any way with water rights in the lower basin.

(b) Provide for longtime holdover storage to make water running off during wet years available for use during dry years.

(c) Provide power, the revenues from which pay costs of power facilities with interest and help pay the irrigation costs.

I might mention the fact that storage in Glen Canyon and Echo Park may be carried over for a period of as long as 25 years, at least in part. That is what makes those dams so necessary. They are called key dams, and they are that, because of their qualities for holding large quantities of water with the lowest evaporation cost.

7. Why was Hoover Dam built?

We in the West have always assumed that everyone knew the answer to that question. However, in discussion with people in the East and with Members of Congress, I find that many people still do not know why it was built. I will give the reasons why I believe it was built:

(1) To provide for river regulation and flood control, so as to store the water and prevent floods, and to store the water that was running into Salton Sea and destroying the farming areas in that area.

(2) It was not built primarily to provide water for consumptive use or power.

(3) Once the river was controlled, however, the water from Lake Mead became available for both consumptive uses (irrigation and domestic) and for power.

(4) The consumptive users of this water pay nothing for the cost of river regulation and control which made their consumptive use developments possible.

By that I mean that the people who get the benefit of having water in the low seasons do not pay anything for the cost of the storage. That is why it is possible for some persons to talk about the low costs in Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley, and other valleys. They have not had to pay for the storage.

(5) The power from Hoover Dam is sold at very low rates. We hear a great deal about the cost of power being 1½ mills for emergency power, and probably 2½ mills for firm power.

(6) Water for consumptive use and power resulting from the Hoover Dam construction have made the remarkable growth of southern California possible.

In that connection it should be stated that the cost of the power that has been quoted is the cost at the busbar, at the generator. It has cost Los Angeles and the other power districts a considerable

amount of money to build the transmission lines, which is one of the heaviest costs connected with a power investment. Los Angeles does not get its power at 2½ mills. Los Angeles pays a little more than that. That fact has not been brought out too clearly.

8. Why is it necessary to plan for a basin-wide development?

(1) The full development of the Colorado River is totally dependent upon storage reservoirs to make early season flow available during the late season of any one year and to hold water running off the watersheds during wet years so that it can be made available during dry years.

(2) The widely fluctuating and erratic flow of the Colorado River requires large capacity reservoirs and long time holdover periods.

It should be mentioned that not only are large reservoirs required to store the water, but at Glen Canyon we must have a large capacity for the storage of silt. The Colorado River is a muddy river. One writer has stated it belches mud all the way down into Mead Lake. It carries a great deal of sediment. It has been estimated that the Glen Canyon construction alone, with the amount allowed for silt control, will extend the life of Hoover Dam 200 years. An extension of 200 years is almost like providing a new dam without cost.

Not one dime is allowed in this measure for the great benefit to be contributed to the lower basin States, particularly the States that get waterpower at the Hoover Dam.

(3) Hoover Dam provided the necessary holdover storage to entirely regulate the river below Hoover Dam.

(4) It will require 9 storage dams to do an equivalent job in the upper basin; of these 9 only 2 are large. The bulk of the storage load must be carried by the Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs and they must be built first.

9. What are the capacities of these two reservoirs and why must they be built first?

I have partly covered that point, but I will give a summary of it:

(1) Echo Park, 6½ million acre-feet; Glen Canyon, 26 million acre-feet.

(2) The lower basin is well along with its development, both consumptive uses and power. The filling of the upper-basin reservoirs must be done without interfering with those rights.

(3) The consumptive uses in the upper basin are now only about 2½ million acre-feet. This leaves 5 million acre-feet per year available for filling upper-basin storage reservoirs without interfering with lower-basin uses.

(4) As consumptive uses upstream increase the water available for filling the reservoirs decreases. If built now, before full consumptive use of water is made in lower basin, additional water would be available for filling, because that water, along with the upper basin's water that is not being used, is going into the sea. It is wasted forever.

10. The annual evaporation losses from Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs are reported to be 613,000 acre-feet. Can this huge loss be justified?

Some Members of the Senate, in discussing that point, have stated that it is a waste of water to store the water behind those dams, because, they have stated, the only reason we are building those dams is for the production of power; therefore, it is a wasting of water to store it for power production, because

a great deal of the water is lost by evaporation. Furthermore, it is claimed that the power could be as easily developed by the use of coal, oil, oil shale, or uranium. That is why, they claim, we are wasting all that water. In answer to the question about the evaporation losses, I should like to give this answer:

(1) It is estimated that 12 percent of the water apportioned to the upper basin will be lost through evaporation. This is the price the upper basin has to pay for the opportunity of utilizing the remaining 88 percent of its water resource. No one objects to burning coal or oil because they cannot get 100 percent efficiency out of it.

I do not know of any electric power production plants using oil or coal which have a 100 percent efficiency in the use of their fuels.

(2) No one objected to Lake Mead because it loses 600,000 acre-feet annually by evaporation or because another 600,000 acre-feet annually is lost below Lake Mead in the reservoirs downstream and in the stream itself.

11. What are the power generating capacities at the proposed storage reservoirs?

	Kilowatts
1. Glen Canyon-----	800,000
2. Echo Park-----	200,000
3. Juniper-----	25,000
4. Currilanti-----	40,000
5. Flaming Gorge-----	72,000

6. All are small except Echo Park and Glen Canyon.

12. Do the Echo Park and Glen Canyon Reservoirs have to be filled before they can produce power?

(1) No. The greater portion of the power head will be available before a third of the storage capacity is filled.

(2) Building these storage reservoirs now will provide early power revenues and make possible an orderly filling of the storage reservoirs without damage to lower users.

13. Why Echo Park Dam? Why is it so important to the project?

Mr. President, I am going to summarize this case tomorrow. I expect to answer the contention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] that the building of the Echo Park Dam will constitute an invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument and will create a dangerous precedent. I might remark, for the benefit of those who will read the RECORD that on March 28 I presented a fully documented case on the Dinosaur National Monument showing who tried to invade and did invade to a limited extent the water reservations and power reservations made many years before. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said in the debate with the Senator from Oregon, the invasion came from the other direction. An effort was made to accomplish an invasion which the President of the United States would not permit when he extended the area from 80 acres to 203,000 acres. Mr. Ickes went along with an agreement with the Federal Power Commission and with the people of the States involved and said there would be no interference with the water program in the areas included in the monument enlargement area. They got together long ago. If Mr. Ickes and Mr. Roosevelt were alive today I am sure they would testify that that was the program.

Now, when the proposals are presented to make effective those water reserva-

tions, objection is raised and we are told we are invading the monument. Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Ickes, and the others involved at that time knew exactly what was happening, and there has not been one single piece of evidence presented to meet the challenge which I laid down before the Members of the Congress. There has not been any evidence brought to this body or to the people of the country showing that I was wrong in any way. They did not impeach that record, and they cannot do so.

Mr. President, here is the summary on the Echo Park Dam:

13. Why Echo Park Dam? Why is it so important to the project?

WHY ECHO PARK DAM SITE WAS SELECTED FOR DEVELOPMENT

Here are the principal advantages of including the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado River Storage project plan:

(1) With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

(2) Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored at Echo Park would be less than at any other major storage site in the upper basin.

(3) Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 120,000 acre-feet in evaporation losses annually—a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

(4) Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating flows of the rivers. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at the Split Mountain and Gray Canyon sites downstream on the Green River.

(5) Use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economic development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to the upstream power market, the proposed system of dams and powerplants, and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer and chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many important minerals.

The opponents of Echo Park Dam claim two objections. First, development of the dam would invade the Dinosaur National Monument. Secondly, it would destroy scenery and rapids. Let's review the facts.

Documents show that the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded in 1938 with the understanding that dams could be built in the area. In fact, the Presidential proclamation states that it shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, and that the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

Echo Park Reservoir would partially inundate 2 or 3 scenic areas, but in so doing it would make possible boating through the beautiful Lodore and Yampa Canyons by many people—not just the adventurous few who now dare to ride the river. The rapids here would be gone, but there would be plenty left for the daredevil river rider on other stretches of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

Mr. President, there are other questions to which I have prepared the answers. I shall not read them into the RECORD tonight, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

14. Under article IIIa of the Colorado River compact, 7½ million acre feet annual beneficial consumptive use were apportioned to the upper and lower basins, respectively, with a further provision in IIId that the upper basin States could not deplete the river at Lee Ferry more than 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10-year period. Based on current streamflow records is there enough water in the river to satisfy article IIId and leave 7½ million acre-feet annually for the upper basin?

Answer. (1) The Colorado River compact, apportioning the beneficial consumptive use of the water between the two basins, is predicated upon regulation and control of the river flow by means of holdover storage reservoirs.

(2) The records of streamflow made by the USGS show an average virgin flow at Lee Ferry of slightly above 15 million acre-feet.

(3) Holdover storage capacity provided in the nine proposed reservoirs (ultimate phase) would be adequate to deliver annually at Lee Ferry not less than 7½ million acre-feet and leave in the upper basin for beneficial consumptive use 7½ million acre-feet.

(4) 7½ million acre-feet annually equals 75 million acre-feet every 10 years as per article IIId of the compact.

15. What is the current consumptive use of water in the upper basin?

Answer. (1) Approximately 2½ million acre-feet annually.

(2) Five million acre-feet annually remain to be put to use before full development of compact apportionment is realized in the upper basin.

16. What will the total consumptive use in the upper basin be after the proposed project is built? Will this use interfere with lower basin rights under the compact no matter what the interpretation of the compact by the Supreme Court?

Answer. (1) The total consumptive use after full development of the proposed project will not exceed 4.3 million acre-feet annually. It will take at least 30 years to put this water to use.

(2) The total use leaves 3.2 million acre-feet annually before the full apportionment to the upper basin is used.

(3) Therefore, the construction of the proposed project can in no way jeopardize the rights in the lower basin no matter how the Supreme Court interprets the compact.

17. Will the proposed project make the quality of water unsuitable for use in the lower basin?

Answer. (1) No.

(2) Transmountain diversions take both salt and water out of the basin.

(3) Storage of water precipitates salt with silt and thus reduces the salt content of water in storage about 12 percent.

(4) Based on studies on the Rio Grande River below Elephant Butte Dam and Lake Mead by the Salinity Laboratory (USDA) and studies on Lake Mead recently completed by the USBR and others, the maximum salt content at Lee Ferry cannot exceed 1 ton per acre-foot. Such water is classified by salinity effects as good and equal to or better than that available at the heading of the Alamo Canal diverting water to the Imperial Valley before the construction of Lake Mead.

(5) Julian Hinds, formerly chief engineer of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, says "Exhaustive studies show that the mineral content under the most unfavorable future conditions will be lower than the average for waters diverted and successfully used in the Yuma and Imperial Valleys prior to the construction of the Hoover Dam.

18. Senator DOUGLAS has said there is a current water shortage at Lake Mead and that, therefore, the upper basin project should not be built. Is this a true statement?

Answer. (1) No. There is no water shortage at Lake Mead.

(2) The level of water in the lake is at the lowest point since the dam was completed. This, however, is not due to a water shortage. It is due to the fact that more water has been taken out of the reservoir to make power than has come in.

(3) At Hoover Dam an acre-foot of water is about equal to a barrel of oil for purposes of power generation. Falling water costs nothing. Oil costs money. Therefore there is an incentive to use water to make power rather than oil. This incentive has overcome judgment and the power head at Hoover Dam has been reduced resulting in a further reduction of power. A depleted reservoir indicates a water shortage. Perhaps this depletion at this time has been deliberate in order to indicate a water shortage.

19. Does the presence of reservoirs in the upper basin jeopardize the water rights in the lower basin?

Answer. (1) No. The Colorado River compact governs the water uses, and the pending legislation provides for integrated administration of the works in the best interests of the parties and the public and the remedies provided for each State in case of controversy.

20. What will be the impact of the proposed project on the agricultural surplus?

Answer. (1) The current agricultural surplus is limited to wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, corn and rice.

(2) Of these, only wheat and corn are grown in the upper-basin States and to a very limited degree. Most of the wheat in these States is grown on dry land, so is not involved; and only a very little corn is produced.

(3) Forage for livestock, some small grains, fruit, vegetables, and sugar beets are the principal crops. These are not in surplus. They are necessary for a balanced diet. They come on the market off season to other parts of the country, and more and more the local market will absorb the entire production.

(4) USDA reports that by 1962, at the present rate of consumption, the production of surplus crops will be in balance with consumption and the surplus will have disappeared.

(5) USDA forecasts a need by 1975 of an additional 115 million equivalent acres of land in production to meet minimum needs.

(6) 70 million of these equivalent acres will come from increased efficiencies of production. 45 million of these acres will have to come from new lands.

(7) The maximum that can be reclaimed from cutover and swamplands is about 21 million acres.

(8) A maximum of 6 million acres of irrigated land can be developed.

(9) It appears that by 1975 there will be a shortage of food supplies.

21. How does cost of installed power capacity at hydro and steam plants compare?

Answer. (1) They are not really comparable. Steam power plants use expendable fuel. The first cost of the boilers and steam turbines are much less expensive than the hydraulic turbines, penstocks, pipelines, and storage or equalizing reservoirs required in hydroelectric plants. Furthermore, dams and storage reservoirs are usually multipurpose but the cost is allocated to power alone.

(2) Steam plants use fuel which is expendable. The costs of operation are very much higher. The advantage of lower cost installation is more than offset by the higher operation costs.

(3) The real criteria to compare the cost of steam and electric plants is the cost per kilowatt-hour produced and delivered to the load centers.

(4) Federal Power Commission and private power companies in addition to the USBR state that steam power cannot compete with hydropower from proposed plants on the upper Colorado.

(5) USBR figure for cost of steam power in the upper-basin area is 7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. Equivalent costs of power at Echo Park and Glen Canyon computed by Federal Power Commission is 5.6 and 4.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

22. How does the cost of hydroplants on the Columbia, Tennessee, St. Lawrence, and the lower Colorado compare with the projects in the upper basin?

Answer. (1) They are not comparable.

(2) In some cases the reported costs include the transmission lines, substations, transformer, and all other appurtenant works. In other cases they do not.

(3) At Hoover Dam you are comparing costs as of 1930 with costs as of 1954. The cost of materials and labor has increased several times, and, at the same time, the value of the dollar has decreased. Therefore you can't compare the cost of two plants built 20 years apart. Improved design and increased efficiency have also increased cost.

(4) The cost of power per kilowatt-hour depends partially on the point at which it is delivered. Some cost reports give cost at bus bar, some for falling water, and some at load centers. It is misleading and unfair to compare costs that are not comparable.

(5) The 6-mill rate proposed for power from project plants is a competitive rate and not the cost of generating and delivery at load centers. The net profits from power revenues will be used to help pay costs of irrigation.

23. The proposed project is claimed to be a reclamation project. The cost figures show that the cost of power and municipal installations greatly exceed the cost of irrigation. How do you justify this project as a reclamation project?

Project	Land to be served (acres)			Total	Irrigation allocation	Cost per acre
	New	Supplemental	Indian			
Central Utah.....	28,540	131,840	42,630	203,010	\$127,354,000	\$627
Emery County.....	3,630	20,450	-----	24,080	9,865,500	400
Gooseberry.....	-----	16,400	-----	16,400	5,727,500	349
12 participating projects.....	132,360	250,330	42,630	425,320	205,476,900	483

(4) These costs are not excessive:

(a) It is true they exceed the market value of the land today. The true measure is the present worth of this joined land and water resource 50 years from today.

(b) Joining good land and good water makes good management, creates renewable wealth.

(c) This new wealth provides homes and jobs and other general public benefits.

(d) The record shows that farms are bought and paid for once each generation. In 100 years this means a given farm would be bought and paid for, out of its earnings, four times. If the land and water were to become nonproductive at the end of 100 years, the present value would be worth at least \$1,000 per acre.

(5) Any project which will join good land and good water under management which will keep these resources producing in perpetuity and return annually sufficient income to pay the operation, maintenance and replacement costs and enough in addition to build up a reasonable equity is fully justified.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in addition, I have statements with respect to various questions which have been

Answer (1) S. 500 shows a total cost of \$1,092,999,800.

(2) Nonreimbursable costs \$8,238,000.

(3) Cost allocations for 5 dams and 12 participating projects:

(a) Power, \$655,651,000.

(b) Municipal, \$45,500,000.

(c) Irrigation, \$378,109,900; water users will pay \$82,921,500, power will pay \$295,-278,400.

(4) Cost of additional participating projects which are subject to further approval and authorization by Congress—21 projects:

(a) Total, \$558,173,300.

(b) Nonreimbursable, \$470,000.

(c) Power, \$953,000.

(d) Municipal, \$26,775,000.

(e) Irrigation, \$529,975,300; water users will pay \$103,365,700, power will pay \$426,-609,600.

(5) Total cost of storage and the two groups of participating projects, \$1,658,460,-100.

(6) The total cost is large. Power and municipal features represent 44 percent of the total cost. Irrigation 56 percent.

(7) Water for consumptive use in irrigation is the first objective. Power is incidental thereto but a valuable byproduct, the use of which makes the reclamation project economically feasible. The energy of the falling water costs nothing. The cost of facilities necessary to develop it is repaid to Government with interest.

24. How can the per-acre costs of irrigation be justified?

Answer (1) The irrigation costs per acre are high but not as high as have been reported by the opponents.

(2) It is dishonest arithmetic when per-acre costs are computed by dividing the total cost of the project, including power and municipal features, by the number of acres served. Costs as high as \$5,000 per acre have been reported. Such figures are just not true.

(3) The following tabulation shows typical costs per acre and average costs for the 12 participating projects proposed for authorization.

raised before this body, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. PAYMENT OF COSTS ALLOCATED TO IRRIGATION: THREE UTAH PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

The central Utah project will provide a full water supply for 28,540 acres of new land and a supplemental supply for 131,840 acres of land which is now partially irrigated. The estimated total cost of the project as of 1953 is \$231 million dollars, of which 6 million is nonreimbursable. For this total, power will repay \$47 million, municipal water will repay \$45 million, \$127 million will be charged to irrigation. Of this, the water users will repay \$15 million, and the balance will come from power revenues from the local projects and Echo and Glen Canyon power plants. Consumptive water users will pay 35 percent, revenues from project plants will pay 27 percent, and revenues from main stream power plants will pay 35 percent. The power, municipal, and irrigation allocations will be paid out within 50 years.

STATEMENT ON CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT—UTAH INITIAL PHASE OF PROJECT

The initial phase of the project would provide for the irrigation of 28,540 acres of new land and 131,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water. Full seasonal regulation would be provided for 42,600 acres of land in the Duchesne River area, more than half of which is owned by Indians or has been acquired from them; 48,800 acre-feet of water would be provided annually for municipal, industrial, and other miscellaneous uses. Power plants with an installed capacity of 61,000 kilowatts would generate approximately 373 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. Approximately 2.2 million kilowatt-hours of energy would be required by the project for irrigation and drainage pumping. Central Utah project powerplants would be interconnected with plants of the Colorado River storage project.

Preliminary land classification surveys of the project lands indicate that they would be suitable for sustained crop production under irrigation farming.

Summary data, central Utah project initial phase, Utah irrigated acreage

New land.....	28,540
Supplemental.....	131,840
Total.....	160,380

Principal agricultural production: Alfalfa, grain, fruit, vegetables, sugar beets, tomatoes; dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

The Gooseberry project located in central Utah consists of a storage reservoir on the Price River, a tributary to the Colorado, and a transmountain diversion tunnel to the San Pitch River, a tributary to the Sevier River in the Boneville Basin. The Sanpete Valley, which is supplied with water from the San Pitch River, is an established agricultural area. Its agricultural production, however, is limited to subsistence by annual water shortages. These annual water shortages will be practically eliminated on 16,400 acres of land by the construction of this project which will provide supplemental water for this area and stabilize its agriculture. It will cost \$5,760,500, of which \$33,000 is non-reimbursable. Of the reimbursable costs, \$3,352,000 will come from power revenues.

Gooseberry project, Utah: The potential Gooseberry project would divert water from a headwater tributary in the Colorado River Basin to improve the irrigation water supply and thus the agricultural production, of 16,-400 acres of arable lands in the Bonneville Basin in Sanpete County, central Utah.

The general type of farming now practiced in the area would be continued with project development. Agriculture would continue to center around the livestock industry with more than 95 percent of the irrigated area producing alfalfa, pasture, and small grains for livestock feed. Principal livestock would include dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

A preliminary land classification survey indicates that the project lands would be suitable for sustained production of crops under irrigation farming. Detailed land classification would be required to confirm the suitability of all the lands.

Summary data, Gooseberry project, Utah, irrigated acreage

New land.....	None
Supplemental.....	16,400
Total.....	16,400

Principal agricultural production: Alfalfa, pasture, grain, dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

The Emery County project consists of a storage reservoir, a diversion dam, and a main canal to distribute the storage water to the existing irrigation companies. The Emery County project will provide a supplemental water supply for 20,450 acres of land and a full supply for 3,630 acres. This additional

water will expand the agriculture of the area through the introduction of late-season crops and stabilize both the production of forage and the livestock industry which is dependent upon it.

The Emery County project will cost \$9,-865,500, of which \$229,000 is nonreimbursable. Of this reimbursable cost, the water users will pay \$3,715,000, and the balance of \$5,921,500 will come from power reserves.

Statement on Emery County project, Utah: The potential Emery County project is planned primarily to improve the irrigation water supply and thus better the agricultural production of 24,080 acres of land in Emery County in east central Utah near the towns of Huntington, Castle Dale, and Orangeville. The project is in the Green River Basin, a part of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The general type of farming now practiced in the area would be continued with project development. Agriculture would continue to center around the livestock industry with more than 90 percent of the irrigated area producing hay and grains. The increased production in livestock feed would permit increased production on the farm of beef, sheep, pork, and dairy products.

Summary data, Emery County project, Utah, irrigated acreage

New land.....	3, 630
Supplemental.....	20, 450
Total.....	24, 080

Alfalfa, grain, peaches, vegetables; dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

B. RECLAMATION PROJECTS AND THE SMALL FARMER: UTAH A TYPICAL CASE

There are two major weaknesses which confront farmers in Utah. The most important impact of these weaknesses is upon farm income, which I shall comment upon in detail in a moment.

The first of these weaknesses or handicaps is the small size of the average farming unit. In a country such as the United States where 9 percent of our farms produce 51 percent of the total value of all farm produce sold (and 22 percent produced 74 percent), it is evident that the most basic problem confronting American agriculture is not price support but the great number—over 80 percent—of our farms which are just too small to yield their operators satisfactory levels of living. Utah agriculture is a typical case in point, and it comprises part of this basic national agricultural problem.

Twelve and four-tenths percent of Utah's population in 1950 was engaged in agriculture. These people received in 1952 only 7.4 percent of the State's total income payments which went to Utahans. These people lived by and large on irrigated farms which averaged only 23 acres. But 23-acre farms, cultivated intensively as they are in Utah, are small family-sized farms, with a large number being classified, from the economic point of view, as marginal. As a result, an abnormally high percentage of Utah farmers are part-time farmers.

This problem has its roots in pioneer history. The size of farms has always been small; partly because irrigation made it a necessity, partly because of the philosophy of the early pioneers, which held that a family shouldn't own more land than its members could work. The small farm from the beginning was also an economic necessity because of the difficulty of physically developing an irrigation system. Modern canal and ditch digging tools were unknown. The task was so great that even with group action the canals could not be made of sufficient size to irrigate a large land acreage for each family. Nor was it possible to develop adequate water storage facilities for the same reasons. At present, therefore, the primary economic need of Utah agriculture

is to expand the opportunity for full-time employment of its farming population.

How can this be done? Dr. W. Preston Thomas, former head of the Agricultural Economics Department at the Utah State Agricultural College, in a recent Utah Agricultural Experiment Station publication concludes that:

This can be done by expanding acreage of upland per farm or by using existing levels more intensively. In most areas of the State neither is possible because of a lack of irrigation water. (Farm and Home Service, March 1955).

The second weakness of Utah agriculture, however, is that the State lacks an adequate supply of water. This, in addition to making for irrigated farms which average only 23 acres in size, has also been responsible for the inability of Utah farmers to adjust the type of farming which prevails to meet the present day market demands which Utah farms are geographically best situated to supply. The result: Smaller markets and low potential farm income. As Dr. Thomas of the Utah State Agricultural College has so aptly put it:

"The home market and the California market normally need, for example; more dairy products, more slaughter beef, more pork, and pork products, more chicken meat, more potatoes and similar products. Because they cannot be produced here, it is necessary to pay transportation costs."

C. HOW RECLAMATION PROJECTS CAN STABILIZE AGRICULTURE ON A REGIONAL BASIS: THE COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT

The 17 Western States, with 61 percent of the land area, have 48.5 percent of the cropland, but only 25 percent of the Nation's water supply. Yet, as of 1950, 94 percent of all the irrigated farmland in the United States, was located in these 17 States. As the President's Water Resources Policy Commission so ably phrased it in 1950: "Crop production in the Colorado River basin is dependent almost wholly on irrigation" (vol. 2, Ten Rivers in America's Future, No. 5, the Colorado, p. 11).

It is the shortage of water which has and will continue to limit land development in the western United States. Reservoirs of all sizes have been built to serve two major purposes:

1. To impound the early run-off waters; and

2. To control the flow for use as needed. From a practical standpoint, as Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, director, farm and land management research, Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture told the National Association of County Agricultural Agents last October, "The land in the valley may be almost valueless without a right to use some of the water stored in a mountain reservoir."

The part played by the reclamation project known as the Colorado-Big Thompson in alleviating the effect of the 1954 drought in Colorado is standing proof of the validity of Dr. Johnson's observation. Almost simultaneously with the completion of the major project works in the spring of 1954 came the worst drought in Colorado history. In this respect, the Bureau of Reclamation in its publication, *The Colorado-Big Thompson Project and the Drought of 1954*, stated:

"The basic water supply for the irrigated lands was, in most respects, the worst on record. Soil moisture content had shrunk to approximately 15 percent of normal, precipitation averaged about 50 to 60 percent of normal, and natural runoff dwindled to less than 40 percent of normal" (p. 6).

The Big Thompson's storage reservoirs, however, made possible the delivery of 300,352 acre-feet of supplemental water, which, when added to the natural runoff supply, though way below normal, and non-project storage, brought up to normal the

farmers' total water supply for the 1954 crop year.

What did this mean to Colorado agriculture? Namely, that the normal crop production level was nearly attained. Specifically the economists of the Bureau of Reclamation put it:

"Had the project water not been available, less than half a crop could have been harvested. Translated into terms of dollars, the difference amounted to \$22 million. The worst year on record was licked. Widespread financial distress, delinquent payments, foreclosures, and all the other painful spawnings of drought were prevented.

"Throughout the area which normally provides about one-fifth of Colorado's agricultural production, and also purchases about one-fifth of the products needed by all the State's farmers, business activity remained strong and healthy, some 75,000 nonfarm residents had a better income as a direct result of the project's victory over drought."

(The Colorado-Big Thompson Project and the Drought of 1954, p. 6.)

The stabilizing effect of reclamation projects in general is not limited to the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This observation is the essence of a letter dated February 8, 1955, which I received from W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. In part this letter pointed out that:

"There is a striking parallel between this story of success and the contributions other reclamation projects are making to the local, regional, and national economies. What the Colorado-Big Thompson project contributed in 1954, and will continue to contribute in the future, to the economic well-being of Colorado and the Nation in a large measure was being duplicated on other reclamation projects throughout the 17 western States.

"This record of accomplishment, moreover, leads to the inescapable conclusion that similar substantial gains to the local, regional, and national economies can be expected from construction of other projects."

In this respect the Colorado River storage project with its dozen participating projects is no exception. There projects will provide supplemental water for 250,333 acres of irrigated land, and in addition will also provide water for 152,360 acres of new irrigated land.

D. PAYMENT OF COSTS ALLOCATED TO IRRIGATION: ENTIRE PROJECT

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission was created on January 3, 1950, by Executive Order 10045 for the purpose of recommending to the President "policies which should be followed by the Federal Government in fulfilling its proper responsibilities for the development, conservation, and use of the Nation's water resources." One of the major problems which had to be resolved involved the extent and character of the Federal Government's participation in major water resources programs.

With respect to multiple-purpose dams, such as those contemplated by the Colorado River storage project, the Commission concluded that:

"When multiple-purpose dams are built with Federal funds, the Federal Government enters the field of economic enterprise. The justification for this is beyond question: No other agency can command sufficient capital resources or provide the coordination necessary for the construction of these great projects. But Government enterprise does not in any way supplant private enterprise. Rather, its purpose is to provide the opportunity for the further expansion and healthy functioning of a free, competitive economy" (p. 8).

This conclusion has particular significance for financing the irrigation construction costs associated with the Colorado River project, since all lands easily irrigated have been developed primarily by local and private sources.

Dr. W. P. Thomas, former head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Utah State Agricultural College, writing in the *Farm and Home Science* magazine for March 1955, published by the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station, has summarized this problem as it affects Utah as follows:

"Utah is an arid region. Irrigation was born of necessity, and Utah settlers were forced to be pioneers in irrigation development. * * * The building of homes, the growth of communities, and the entire culture of the area have been closely interwoven with the progress and development of irrigation. From the beginning, the construction and rise of irrigation facilities were considered community problems, and now, after more than a century of development, the irrigation enterprises are dominantly small, cooperative, mutual companies. With the exception of a few Federal projects, irrigation development has been by community groups. It is quite natural that under such conditions and in a pioneer economy, the development should include only the lands and water facilities that could be most economically developed. A program for development of all the land and water resources is a vital need for Utah.

"As a result of this type of development, some irrigated lands have an inadequate water supply and some of the better lands have no water at all—yet in some places water remains unused. The financial requirements for developing these resources, however, are beyond the capacity of community groups alone."

The great effort which generally has been made by private sources to develop the water potential of this area has been described by Rainer Schickle, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, in his excellent book, *Agricultural Policy*, as follows:

"In 1948, an estimated 22 million acres of land were under irrigation on about 300,000 farms, most of it in the 17 western States. The water for approximately 70 percent of this land was supplied by private individuals or cooperative enterprises, 20 percent by irrigation districts, and 10 percent by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and other public agencies. Most of the land that can be irrigated at low cost is now so used, development and water cost per acre of additional irrigated land is rising sharply. This rise in per acre cost is only partly tempered by technological progress in construction methods and by the fact that the new water supply often comes from reservoirs which are not primarily built for irrigation purposes. This means that most of the land to be brought under irrigation in the future will depend upon public projects for water supply" (p. 125).

Repayment of all irrigation costs by farmers is not possible. On most of the projects now contemplated, irrigators will be unable to repay all such costs. The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, in cognizance of this fact, recommended that:

"The primary beneficiaries of reclamation activities should repay without interest an amount assessed according to their ability to pay, based upon annual net income which the farmers derive from the project, under a formula adjusting repayment to production and marketing conditions, this amount to include the full costs of operation and maintenance of facilities. An agreed portion of the remaining investment cost allocated to reclamation should be assumed by the local communities, conservancy districts, or interests receiving secondary benefits from the project under arrangements with the State or States in which the projects are located.

"The remaining cost should be borne by the Federal Government as a measure of national interest." (*A Water Policy for the American People*, vol. 1, pp. 84-85.)

Dr. Schickle, head of the department of agricultural economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, and an outstanding student of the economics of the irrigation aspect of multiple-purpose dams is of a similar opinion. He concludes that:

"The rate of repayment of irrigation development costs by farmers should be geared to what they are able to pay, under average management and prevailing prices after farm operating expenses and minimum adequate family living requirements have been met. This can perhaps be done by allocating to irrigation only those original investments which otherwise would not have been made and by extending the repayment period over a sufficiently long period of time to keep the annual payment rates within farmer's ability to pay. Any residual cost not covered by repayments would then be mainly for the multi-purpose structures, such as major dams, and should be borne by society as a whole." (*Agricultural Policy*, p. 125.)

The ability or inability of irrigation users to pay the costs of multiple-purpose dams, however, is not the controlling factor in determining the economic justification of irrigation projects which will result in a net gain to society as a whole. Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of Interstate Streams for Utah gave an excellent analysis of benefits compared to costs before the House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on March 14 of this year. Dr. Clyde said:

"The Bureau of Reclamation benefit-cost analysis recognizes three main types of tangible benefits:

"Direct benefits: Benefits derived from increased production of farm products (from detailed farm budget analysis); increased production of electric power; reduction of damage from floods; pollution, and sedimentation; recreation and conservation of fish and wildlife; provision for domestic, municipal, and industrial water and other directly beneficial effects.

"Indirect benefits: Benefits derived from the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers.

"Public benefits: Represent the increase or improvement in settlement, job, investment opportunities, community facilities and services, and the stabilization of the local and regional economy.

"The construction of a reclamation project which brings together land, water, and people creates new wealth. New wealth is a benefit in any language. A good index of the value of the benefits is the broadened tax base and rise in income taxes which have followed the construction of every reclamation project in the United States.

"The cost side of the benefit-cost comparison includes all costs: Construction, interest on all unpaid balances, and costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement.

"All recommended units of the Colorado storage project and participating projects, collectively and individually, have tangible benefits greater than costs. For the projects in my State the benefit-cost ratios are as follows:

"Central Utah, 1.23 to 1.

"Gooseberry, 1.2 to 1.

"Emery County, 1.38 to 1."

The bill, S. 500, contemplates the use of electric-power revenues from project powerplants in order to keep the repayment schedules for irrigation farmers within their ability to pay, rather than relying entirely upon the Federal Government to meet this expense or as recommended by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. The use of power revenues from the project to pay off a portion of the irrigation costs is not a subsidy to irrigation, since, as Dr. George D. Clyde,

commissioner on interstate streams for Utah, told the Senate Interior Committee:

"There are many indirect benefits to citizens in both the local, and State, and the national areas. Property values increase where agriculture is stabilized. Business improves when the farmers are making money. The tax base is broadened and industries and services are established in prosperous agricultural communities. It is the accepted national policy that reclamation projects be supported with interest-free money for construction because of the indirect benefits accruing to the general public at all levels. The water users and the indirect beneficiaries from an irrigation project are the same people. Therefore, the use of power revenues to pay indirect benefits is not a subsidy but an equitable method of assessing indirect beneficiaries for their share of the cost of the irrigation works. Interest-free money for irrigation works is no more a subsidy than the use of Federal funds for flood control or river and harbor improvement, none of which costs are ever repaid. The use of power revenues to pay costs of irrigation works above the ability of the water users to pay is not a subsidy and this money does not come out of the taxpayers' pockets. It is compensation for the use of the water belonging to the upper basin States for the purpose of producing power. The upper basin States are the owners of the right to use the water allocated to them by the Colorado River compact for all beneficial purposes, including power. It, therefore, follows that if these waters are used to make hydropower, the upper basin States are entitled to compensation for such use. The upper basin States are not asking for all the revenues from this use, but only sufficient to pay a portion of the irrigation costs. The power revenues from this project will be sufficient to pay the cost of power facilities with interest and the cost of irrigation facilities, without interest, over and above the ability of the irrigators to pay in a period of 50 years. After that time the recurring water will produce power revenues in addition to the annual cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement of \$15 to \$20 million a year which will pour into the public treasury." (Hearings on S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, p. 142.)

All units: Storage and participating

Construction costs:	
Total-----	\$1, 092, 999, 800
Nonreimbursable-----	8, 238, 900
Reimbursable-----	1, 084, 760, 900
Irrigation-----	378, 109, 900
Repayment: Water users-----	82, 921, 500
Repayment: Power revenues-----	996, 339, 400

E. AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC STUDIES INDICATE NEED FOR PROJECT

In order to appraise the impact of the Colorado River storage project upon the agriculture of the upper basin States, or that of any other like project upon the agriculture of a given area, basic economic projection studies are needed. Such studies in advance of construction, and followup studies, have been made for other projects in the upper Colorado Basin area either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations of the States concerned.

For example, the justification of one such project in Utah, the Weber Basin project, from an agricultural standpoint, was the subject of such a study by three agricultural economists of the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the USDA. Headed by Dr. G. T. Blanch, presently the chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics of Utah State Agricul-

tural College, these economists concluded with respect to the Weber Basin project that:

"Based on the results of their own work and their confidence in the conclusions reached by others * * * working on the project, the economic investigators believe that lands proposed for irrigation within the Weber Basin project could be developed into satisfactory farms through the proposed development of irrigation and drainage facilities; that it is highly probable that an economically and socially satisfactory system of agriculture would result; and that, in addition to supporting the farm families and community institutions at a reasonable level, agriculture can contribute substantial amounts toward the cost of operating and construction of the project and the repayment of construction costs." (Fuhrman, Blanch & Stewart, Weber Basin Reclamation project, Utah (Logan: Agricultural Experiment Station, USAC, Special Rept. No. 7, Dec. 1952, p. 32).)

Prior to the authorization of the Weber Basin project, the Echo and Pine View Reclamation projects were constructed making possible the delivery of a full supplemental supply of water to farmland located in the area served. Have the results confirmed the findings of the USDA agricultural economists referred to above? Have they justified the cost involved? During the 1954 hearings of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the Colorado River project, I asked these questions of Mr. E. O. Larson, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation, which encompasses the upper basin States. The colloquy was as follows:

"Senator WATKINS. Do you have in mind any project, for instance, in the State of Utah where you could illustrate the benefits that come to the United States, or anywhere else for that matter? It does not matter to me which one you use. I could direct your attention to the Echo project in Utah, which I think is a very good example.

"Mr. LARSON. The Weber River project, or Echo project as it is sometimes called, is not to be confused with Echo Park. It is a very good illustration. On that project, in the early days of the pioneers, about 65 percent of the land was used for the growing of grain, and most of the remainder for alfalfa. Today, the area totals about 75,000 acres. Out of that 75,000 acres only about 8 or 10 percent is used for the growing of grain. There are now many very important crops, such as truck crops, and vegetable and fruit crops for canning. For instance, the tomato crop is very large and is canned there. I might say, too, that the total gross crop value of that project, before the construction of the Echo Reservoir, never exceeded about \$1¼ million and most of the time less than that. Since the construction of Echo Reservoir and a full supplemental supply of water made available, the gross crop value of that project has been as high as \$14 million in 1 year, and \$10 million in many years.

"Senator WATKINS. Of course, that means increased income taxes paid to the United States.

"Mr. LARSON. Several canning factories have been brought in, and there are new businesses of all kinds, and I daresay that increased income tax to the United States as a result of that water is many times the construction payment by the water users.

"Senator WATKINS. It has provided for employment of additional men and women? That is a general result, is it not, on a project of that kind?

"Mr. LARSON. Yes." (Hearings on S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, p. 82.)

It is significant to point out that Mr. Larson's reply indicated not only that agricultural income of the farmers concerned had been increased nearly 10 times, but also that the supplemental water provided had been instrumental in changing the type

of crops produced. A few short years ago 65 percent of the 75,000 acres were used for grain production. Today only 9 percent are used for that purpose. What is significant about this trend? Namely, that reclamation projects such as this do not result in the production of commodities which are in surplus supply today. Most of this land—over 90 percent—is used for the production of forage for livestock, truck and canning vegetable and fruit crops—crops which are not even subject to price support by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The agricultural economists of the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station in 1949 made just such an economic appraisal of the potential effects of the Colorado River project upon Utah's agriculture. And in March 1954 their salient conclusions were contained in abbreviated form in the periodical Farm and Home Science, published by the State Agricultural Experiment Station. These studies revealed that:

1. Only 40 percent or 408,000 acres of irrigated land has an adequate water supply.
2. Only 2,875,000 acre-feet of water is now available annually for irrigation.
3. But 5,039,000 acre-feet of water will be available annually for irrigation if the water resources are developed.

They likewise revealed, if the water resources of the State are developed in a manner anticipated and provided for in S. 500, that—

1. Ninety percent of the irrigated lands within the area served after development would have an adequate water supply. This would represent an increase of 125 percent of land having an adequate supply.
2. Seventy percent increase in crop production after development.

In summarizing the import of Colorado River project upon Utah's agriculture, Dr. W. Preston Thomas, head of the department of agricultural economics at Utah State Agricultural College, at the time of the basic study referred to, which was completed in 1949, stated:

"At the present time 80 percent of labor utilized in agriculture is employed on irrigated farms. Of the total agricultural income for Utah, 75 percent is derived from irrigated farming, 20 percent comes from range livestock, and only 5 percent from dry farming. According to range conservationists the number of livestock that can be grazed on Utah ranges is limited and the small amount of rainfall in most areas restricts the expansion of dry farming.

"It therefore follows that Utah's opportunity for agricultural expansion and development and the addition of new agricultural wealth lies in the further development and more efficient use of irrigation water within the State including its transfer from the Colorado River to the Bonneville Basin."

This problem is not peculiar to Utah's agriculture but is common to that of every upper basin State in particular, as concerns the Colorado River project, and all the western agricultural States in general. The significance of this situation was ably depicted by Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, director of farm and management research, Agricultural Research Service, USDA. In a talk last October before the National Association of County Agricultural Agents in Salt Lake City, he dramatically told the assembled delegates that—

"Today the 17 Western States, with 61 percent of the land area, have 48.5 percent of the cropland * * *, they have (however) only about one-fourth of the Nation's water supply.

"About 94 percent of all of the irrigated land in farms in 1950 was found in the 17 Western States—77 percent of it in the 11 Mountain and Pacific States. In these 11 States, about a third of the cropland is irrigated. * * * Reservoirs of all sizes are built

to impound the floodwaters and to control the flow for use as needed by crops and pasture, and by the cities and towns. * * * The land in the valley may be almost valueless without a right to use some of the water stored in a mountain reservoir.

"Looking ahead, the shortage of water will limit land development in the West. At the present time over 90 percent of the water that is consumptively used in the West is for irrigation. With rapid growth of population in the Far Western States, some of this water will have to be shared with cities and towns for industrial and municipal uses. Some new irrigation projects are under consideration, and taking the 17 Western States as a whole, perhaps some 5 million acres of additional land might be irrigated by 1975" (pp. 5, 6, and 9).

F. RECLAMATION PROJECTS AND SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

One issue which has been raised with respect to the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects involves the use of reclamation to bring in new land, when, as the opponents say, we are plagued with the problem of agricultural surpluses. Why, they ask, should large sums of money be invested in projects which bring new lands into production through irrigation when large amounts of Federal funds are now being spent to support farm prices.

Here is the answer, which I shall try and condense, although it has many aspects which must be considered:

1. The crops grown in the four upper basin States are not in surplus nor are they crops now under price support. In addition, however, the new water supply made possible by the project will not be used in their production.

In Utah, only 7 percent of the cash receipts of farmers are from basic commodities, notably wheat. In Wyoming, farmers receive only 8 percent of their cash from receipts from the sale of basic commodities. Colorado farmers received 18 percent of their income from basic commodities, of which 17.6 percent is derived from wheat. This wheat, however, is grown in eastern Colorado on lands which will never utilize water from the Colorado River. New Mexico farmers received 38 percent of their income from the role of basic commodities of which cotton, grown in southern New Mexico, constitutes 37 percent. No water from participating projects authorized by S. 500 will find its way into the agricultural production of this area. As President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission reported in 1950:

"Livestock raising is the basin's principal agricultural pursuit, particularly in the northern region. * * * Moreover, 30 percent of the basin's irrigated land is used to grow alfalfa as winter feed for the many kinds of sheep and cattle that graze the range."

2. Agricultural production due to the increased supply of water from the participating projects will not be a fact for many years to come if this bill were passed by the Congress and signed by the President today.

It will require 25 to 30 years to construct the initial phase of the project, over 20 years to fill the reservoirs in the project, and 100 years to develop complete utilization of the upper basin's share of the water. So it is evident that even if the crops which are produced in the upper basin States did constitute a surplus problem, which they do not, it would be impossible for added production due to project water to make a material contribution for at least 10 years.

3. By the time when the initial phases of the upper Colorado River project are completed—25 years from now—the American people will need all of the agricultural production our farm economy can produce.

President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission estimated in 1950 in the light

of future food requirements that not only are the present food surpluses temporary, but also that 100 million additional cropland acres will be needed by 1975.

This estimated need of 100 million additional acres of cropland takes into account the reduced need for feed for horses and that export acreage would remain constant. The Commission estimated the potential sources of meeting this additional need as follows:

Source	Acres
1. Acre equivalent of ordinary farm land reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection--	21,000,000
2. Newly irrigated land (equivalent)-----	9,000,000
3. Increased productivity on present lands under cultivation (assuming that productivity would increase 18 percent by 1975 over the base period 1945-49)-----	46,000,000
Total-----	76,000,000

This potential of 76 million leaves a need for an additional 24 million acres of crop land.

On the basis of its analysis and conclusions, the Commission concluded that:

"Reclamation of new land through irrigation, flood control, drainage, and clearing, and improvement in the use of existing farm lands, must move forward together if the future needs of the Nation are to be met. It tends to controvert the contention that reclamation of new lands should be curtailed because of surpluses in certain agricultural commodities."

It is evident that the rate at which the land can be brought into production is much less than the demand for increased production can possibly be. It is for this reason that the United States Department of Agriculture estimated that by 1962 our present agricultural surpluses will have disappeared.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have a further statement on the many problems connected with the project, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS
RELATIVE TO S. 500, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE
PROJECT BILL

Many people, essentially uninformed conservationists who should know better, have been challenging the engineering studies of the Colorado River storage project, questioning data as to dam structure foundations, and even charging that possible alternatives to the recommended project units have not been given adequate consideration.

At the risk of dignifying these unreasonable and wholly unfounded charges, I wish to take a few moments to review some of the historical background of the extensive and detailed engineering investigation that went into the Department of the Interior report which was the basis for S. 500, now before the Senate. As a serious student of reclamation policy and practitioner of reclamation law for 17 years before coming to Congress, and as a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since 1947, I can assure the Senate that no other water resources development project to my knowledge has come before this body with the thorough and competent engineering study which constitutes the foundation of this measure. Furthermore, S. 500 represents the type of well-planned, basinwide, multiple-purpose water-resource project that some

Members of this body have been demanding for years, and it reflects the type of comprehensive engineering, economic, and resource planning that, in my estimation, should become compulsory for proposed water-resource developments in the future.

In making that statement, I do not wish to throw discredit on any other area that is obliged to bring individual water-resource projects before the Congress in advance of basinwide planning. Such basinwide planning takes time and demands that States agree on their basic needs and objectives. In our case, we were forced into a basinwide approach. Downstream delivery commitments agreed to by the four upper basin States in the Colorado River compact of 1922, forced us to regard holdover water storage as a first consideration in plans to utilize water from the Colorado River. The costs and complexities of fulfilling this requirement necessitated that we work together and cooperate with the Government agencies that undertook to work out a plan for solving the engineering and economic problems involved.

We also were fortunate in having the funds to finance such costly planning and engineering investigation. Roughly \$10 million, derived from funds accruing to the upper basin States from Hoover Dam power, and contributions from States involved, has been allocated for these basinwide investigations conducted over 25 years.

Engineering investigations in the upper Colorado River Basin actually began as early as 1904, over half a century ago. At that time, a reconnaissance survey of the Green River, covering portions of the stream now considered for some of the controversial units of the Colorado River storage project, was made by the Bureau of Reclamation. I hereby introduce at the end of my remarks, as exhibit 1, an extract from the seventh annual report of the Reclamation Service, 1907-8, which refers to this survey.

(See exhibit 1.)

You will note from this extract that by 1908, Flaming Gorge, 1 of the 9 storage-dam sites in the Colorado River project, had already been under engineering study as a reservoir site. Borings also had been made at the Browns Park Dam site, covered in the 1904 reclamation withdrawal exempted in the Dinosaur Monument proclamation of 1938.

Island Park also was under active consideration as a potential reservoir site at that time, but it subsequently was dropped in favor of two better adjoining sites, Echo Park and Split Mountain. Island Park, like its better known neighbor, Echo Park, also is not a National or State park in any sense of the word. Both are just wide spots on the Green River.

I will not bother to make similar citations from other annual reports of the Bureau of Reclamation or from similar reports of the United States Corps of Engineers, which also made river control studies of the Colorado at various times during the past half century.

Water studies on the Colorado River were summarized in the Department of the Interior's Water Supply Paper 395, published in 1916. It is significant that by this time, five more dam sites on the Green and Yampa Rivers, within the present boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument had been under active consideration. At that time, however, Dinosaur Monument was confined to its original quarry section of 80 acres, which had been set aside by Presidential proclamation in 1915.

Extracts from this study are interesting in that they point out that engineering studies already were well advanced by that date. I introduced these excerpts at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2.

(See exhibit 2.)

In 1920 another Federal agency came into the picture—the Federal Power Commission.

This independent agency was established by the Congress pursuant to the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, in order to effect the systematic development of the country's hydropower resources. The FPC also assumed jurisdiction of existing Federal lands reserved for power development, and was given authority to make additional reservations, or withdrawals as they are also known, to protect the public's interest in other potential power sources located in the public domain.

Under authority of this 1920 act, the Utah Power & Light Co., a private power utility interested in developing the power resources of the upper Colorado River, was authorized to participate in a cooperative survey of large sections of the Colorado River and its upper tributaries. This survey resulted in the maps and river profiles published by the Department of the Interior in 1922.

The results of these cooperative studies and other engineering investigations were summarized in a 456-page volume published in 1930, Water Supply Paper 618 of the Department of the Interior. This volume was entitled "The Green River and Its Utilization," and it was written by the late Ralf R. Woolley, one of the all-time great field engineers of the United States Geological Survey and who was incidentally a member of one of the first scientific river-running parties to negotiate the Green River by boat.

I have made a few extracts from this publication to show how extensive were the engineering studies of the Green River by 1930, and I insert these excerpts as exhibit 3, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 3.)

Included in this exhibit are two plates which cannot be reproduced in the RECORD. These are profile maps of both the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, as then proposed.

At that time, the investigations authorized in the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, had just been initiated. These investigations authorized by Congress were to be made by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of producing a comprehensive program for the development of the water resources of the Colorado River, including irrigation, power, and other multiple uses.

Authorization of this large-scale, multiple-purpose investigation in 1928 by the Congress indicates why both reclamation and power withdrawals within the area proposed for inclusion within an expanded Dinosaur National Monument in the mid-1930's would be of concern to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the four upper-basin States interested in development of their allocated share of the river.

Up to 1930, the major interest in the reservoir sites on the Green River in the Green and Yampa Canyon sections, was primarily for power development. This interest is expressed in Mr. Woolley's report. It also is reflected by the fact that there are 10 power site withdrawals valid and in effect within the Dinosaur National Monument extension, and only 1 reclamation withdrawal.

However, both types of withdrawals were clearly of interest to Government engineers engaged in the past quarter century of upper Colorado River water-development investigations. This is emphasized in a letter written on December 13, 1934, by FPC Chairman Frank R. McNinch, in answer to a request from the National Park Service that power withdrawals on the Green and Yampa Rivers be vacated to permit the proposed expansion of the Dinosaur Monument. I hereby introduce, as exhibit 4, the McNinch letter of December 13, 1934, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 4.)

You will note that Chairman McNinch enclosed a copy of Water Supply Paper No. 618 with his letter, along with Yampa and

Green River profile maps, so there is no reason to believe that the National Parks Service was unaware of the tremendous importance of those power resources prior to the Dinosaur Monument expansion.

Now these reports to which I have been referring do not in and of themselves comprise the total field notes and engineering data assembled in that quarter century of earnest study. They represent only the distillation of many hundreds upon hundreds of pages of field notes and project studies.

These multi-agency studies had been extensive up to that time, but on July 19, 1940, investigations of the Colorado River received a tremendous financial shot in the arm. At that time, President F. D. Roosevelt signed the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, which created the Colorado River Development Fund and authorized allocation to it of \$500,000 per year from power revenues. All of the fund revenues from 1940 to 1955 were to be utilized in the investigation of projects under consideration for the comprehensive basinwide water resource development program.

Never before, to my knowledge, has such a large engineering investigation fund been authorized for a river basin study in advance of congressional consideration of the overall project. We residents of the four upper basin States are indebted to President Roosevelt and the 76th Congress for permitting us to utilize our power revenues to supplement contributions by the States for such a thorough and competent basin-wide investigation.

These expanded Colorado River Basin investigations were culminated by the March 1946 publication of *The Colorado River—A Comprehensive Report on the Development of the Water Resources of the Colorado River Basin for Irrigation, Power Production, and Other Beneficial Uses in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming*. This was a 293-page book, amply supplemented with well illustrated charts and maps.

This monumental document presented an inventory of 134 potential projects or units of projects, mostly multiple purpose, for the consideration of the Congress and the States involved in arriving at a final comprehensive development plan. One hundred of these projects were included within the upper basin area.

The 1946 report makes this point: "A great amount of engineering and economic investigational work has been required to assemble and evaluate this information from which has been prepared this inventory of potential projects. Detailed information is available for a substantial number of potential developments and only data of a reconnaissance nature for others, but from all the information available it should be possible, prior to a final settlement of water rights, to select a group of projects which are urgently needed, or which will be key units of the comprehensive plan for construction as the next stage of this development."

To indicate the nature of this report and the extensive engineering information assembled by 1946, I hereby introduce these excerpts from that 293-page document as exhibit 5, at the conclusion of my remarks. (See exhibit 5.)

Information assembled in these very extensive reports and investigations was made available to the four States involved. Each of the States conducted independent studies on its own and made recommendations on projects to the Bureau of Reclamation. The Department of Interior reported that "important contributions" and substantiating materials were provided by the States and by the upper Colorado River Compact Commission.

On December 15, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior submitted his formal report to the Congress on the Colorado River storage proj-

ect, outlining a comprehensive program for development of the upper basin of the Colorado River. This report followed action by the 4 States involved which resulted in the upper basin compact of 1949, allocating among the 4 States the water apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact of 1922.

This detailed upper basin study comprising several hundred pages represents the last formal report issued on the proposed comprehensive development of the Colorado River. However, engineering studies have gone forward in the States involved and in the Bureau of Reclamation since 1950. Furthermore, investigations are still going on and will be continued on individual projects, including some special economic studies called for in this bill, right up to the start of construction.

All of this material, together with the concrete exhibit of a relatively small number of reports and field studies assembled as a floor display, suggests the tremendous scope of the engineering and economic investigations that have been made into this great comprehensive project for development of the water resources of the Colorado River.

All potential reservoir and dam sites on the river have been studied and catalogued. This includes all the so-called "alternatives" to Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

Projects recommended to the Congress are covered by detailed engineering reports, and represent the most efficient and most economical of those that are possible within the basin.

It is a sound project, planned to function for hundreds of years, but designed to pay back the construction costs, including interest on power and municipal features, in 50 years.

Much of the planning was done under a Democratic administration, and the project is now backed wholeheartedly by the present Republican administration, so it is a true product of bipartisan planning and will stand as a monument to both our great political parties, each of which is solidly on record as favoring projects of this nature.

The Colorado River storage project was endorsed in the Senate hearings by Administrator Val Peterson of the Civil Defense Administration. In fact, it is my profound conviction, after hearing Governor Peterson's testimony that the development of this water and power in the mountain area is so important to national defense, that Congress would be justified in going ahead with its authorization and construction, even if the residents of the respective States opposed it, which they most assuredly do not.

From my years of experience with irrigation and reclamation projects, I can wholeheartedly endorse the Colorado River storage project and recommend that the Senate speedily pass Senate 500 so that the desert area involved, and the rest of the Nation, can start receiving its benefits in the shortest time possible.

EXHIBIT 1

EXTRACT FROM SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE, 1907-1908 (P. 57)

The Colorado River projects consist of a number of possible irrigation developments on the lower Colorado River in Arizona and California, the principal of which are the Blythe, Parker, and Needles. Descriptions of the Colorado River projects will be found in the 1st and 2d annual reports. The lands of these projects are to be irrigated with water from the Colorado River, but there is an insufficient normal water supply in the river for the purpose of their proper irrigation. The success of the projects therefore depends on the storage of water in the drainage waters of the Grand and the Green River systems, forming the Colorado River.

A description of the storage reservoirs investigated on the Grand River and its tributaries will be found in the fourth annual report. During 1904 investigations were carried on in connection with certain possible reservoirs on the Green River. A reconnaissance survey of Green River between Green River, Wyo., and Ouray, Utah, was made for the purpose of determining the most feasible location for a storage reservoir that would control the entire flow of the river, and special investigations were made in connection with the Flaming Gorge Reservoir site, Wyoming and Utah; the Browns Park Reservoir site, Utah and Colorado; the Island Park Reservoir site, Utah; the Narrows Reservoir site, Utah; the Ouray Reservoir site, Utah. No feasible dam sites were found in connection with the last two of these reservoir sites.

FLAMING GORGE AND ISLAND PARK RESERVOIR SITES

The Flaming Gorge Reservoir site is located about 40 miles south of Green River, Wyo. The fall of the river above Henrys Fork is quite uniform and light and there are no rapids in the river between Henrys Fork and Green River. The capacity of the reservoir with a 100-foot dam is between 300,000 and 350,000 acre-feet. This capacity is not sufficient to control the flow of the river at the dam. The dam site is located in Flaming Gorge, about 1½ miles below Henrys Fork. The length of the dam at the crest would be about 800 feet and at the present low-water surface about 380 feet. The rock at the dam site consists of hard Uinta seamy sandstone. The stratification is irregular, especially on the right bank, which is a perfect anticlinal flexure. The land covered by the reservoir site is chiefly unimproved.

The Island Park Reservoir site is located in Utah, about 22 miles northeast of Vernal. The capacity of the reservoir with a 100-foot dam is between 130,000 and 15,000 acre-feet. The dam site is located in Split Mountain Canyon and a dam 100 feet high would be 700 feet long at the crest and about 350 feet long at the present low-water surface. The rock at the dam site consists of hard, seamy sandstone with irregular stratification. This reservoir might be utilized for storing the flow of Bear River, thus serving as an auxiliary storage to the Browns Park Reservoir in caring for the flow from this source coming into Green River below Browns Park.

BROWNS PARK RESERVOIR SITE

Browns Park Reservoir site is located in Utah and Colorado, about 55 miles south of Rock Springs, Wyo. The dam site is located in the upper end of Ladon Canyon. The rock at the dam site consists of hard Uinta sandstone and is uniformly bedded. The reservoir would control the flow of the entire river except in the wettest years, and the site is the most feasible of those investigated by the Reclamation Service on Green River. The land covered by the reservoir site consists of winter pasture lands.

During the past season borings at the dam site have been in progress for the purpose of determining the distance to bedrock.

EXHIBIT 2

EXCERPTS FROM WATER SUPPLY PAPER No. 395, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, 1916

What is to be the future of this immense region? Doubtless its forests will be utilized, its mineral wealth will be exploited, its wonderful scenic beauties will be unfolded. Its greatest development must come, however, from its water resources, on which the development of its other resources must largely depend. Without the water afforded by Colorado River and its tributaries this basin would remain forever a barren desert. These rivers make possible not only the construction of large irrigation systems and the growth of towns, cities, and prosperous agri-

cultural communities but also the generation of hydroelectric power for lighting, heating, industrial uses, and the transportation of freight and passengers.

The United States Geological Survey began the study of the water resources of the basin by establishing gaging stations on Gila River at Buttes, Ariz., in 1889. Since that time records of river discharge have been collected at 180 points in the basin. In the collection of these records and in the study of water resources the United States Reclamation Service, the Indian Office, the Forest Service, and the Weather Bureau have cooperated. Each of these Federal bureaus has also made independent investigations of certain questions pertaining to the water resources. The Reclamation Service has investigated the available water supply for particular projects and the feasibility of proposed works that have been more or less definitely outlined. That service has also studied the possibilities of storage on the Gila, San Juan, Grand, and Green rivers, and on the Colorado below the junction of the Grand and Green. The Indian Office has investigated the available water, and its possible uses on the Indian reservations in the basin. The Forest Service has studied the water supply and possible water powers of the national forests. The Weather Bureau has collected records of precipitation, temperature, and evaporation at many points. In addition, the State officials who have had the responsibility of distributing the water among a great number of users and of recording, examining, and approving water filings, have collected a mass of information as to the present and proposed use of the streams in the basin. Much exploratory work has been done by private parties and corporations, irrigation and power projects have been examined, railroad routes have been surveyed, and the Grand Canyon has been traversed by several persons and parties since Major Powell made the pioneer trip. The diversion of water outside the basin to irrigate nearly half a million acres in the Salton Basin, the breach in the river banks and the diversion of the whole flow of the river to the Salton Sink with the resulting danger to and loss of valuable property in Imperial Valley, the spectacular struggle and final success of the Southern Pacific Co. in closing the breach and restoring the flow of the river to the Gulf of California, and the international questions involved in the joint use of the river by the United States and the Republic of Mexico have brought to the attention of the people of the country, as well as to State and Federal officials, first one and then another phase of the many problems involved in the utilization of Colorado River.

The information relating to the water resources that has been collected by many agencies has never been brought together so that a broad view of the possible utilization of the whole river could be obtained. Mr. La Rue has attempted the pioneer work of assembling the principal facts relating to the subject, and especially of studying the possibility of controlling the flow of the whole river by means of storage reservoirs in order to avoid further danger of overflow to the Salton Sink and to render available for profitable use the enormous quantity of water which now flows unused and largely unusable to the Gulf of California in the form of floods.

In discussing the broader problems of the basin, hundreds, yes, thousands, of the minor possibilities and even plans for expansion have necessarily been unmentioned, though future minor developments will have great local importance and in the aggregate considerable national significance. In general such projects do not preclude the larger use of the river but must be undertaken as part of that larger use.

This report does not, of course, contain the last word on the utilization of Colorado River. Additional facts will become known

that may modify the conclusions here recorded. It is hoped, however, that a foundation has been laid for future comprehensive discussion and treatment that will not ignore the effects produced on the present or future utilization of the river by developments in other parts of the basin. The importance of Colorado River to the prosperity of an area extending over seven States warrants broad consideration and perhaps Federal assistance not only in the construction of large irrigation systems and incidental storage works, but also in the important phases of river control.

UNDEVELOPED POWER SITES

Green River Basin

Flaming Gorge Reservoir power site (1): The Flaming Gorge power site is at the dam site for the Flaming Gorge Reservoir in northeastern Utah (pp. 199-201). The elevation of the low-water level of Green River at the dam site in Horseshoe Canyon is 5,825 feet. By constructing a dam to elevation 6,050 for storing to elevation 6,040 feet, the reservoir capacity would be 3,130,000 acre-feet. The storage capacity between the 6,000- and 6,040-foot contour would be 1,210,000 acre-feet, or sufficient to equalize the flow of the river at this point and insure a minimum flow of 2,700 second-feet. By constructing a 3-mile tunnel at elevation 6,000 feet, an effective head of about 290 feet could be obtained. With a head of 290 feet and a flow of 2,700 second-feet, 71,000 brake horsepower could be developed.

Swallow Canyon power site (2): Swallow Canyon is near the upper end of Browns Park, in northeastern Utah. This canyon is about 2 miles long. At its upper end, in sec. 31, T. 2 N., R. 25 E., Salt Lake meridian, an outcrop of solid rock extending across the channel of Green River indicates that it would be practicable to construct a high dam. The water level could be raised about 150 feet without interfering with the development of the Flaming Gorge site. By utilizing the Flaming Gorge Reservoir site, a uniform flow of 2,700 second-feet could be maintained, which, with a head of 150 feet, would make possible the development of 36,800 brake horsepower.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPTS FOR WATER SUPPLY PAPER NO. 618,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
1930

(Preface by Nathan C. Grover)

The Green River and its drainage basin are interesting economically, historically, and scenically. The river constitutes one of the great natural resources of Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. It has had an influence on the exploration, settlement, and development of the West and is woven into the history of the white man's progress throughout a broad region. Its canyons are grand and beautiful but unfortunately are so difficult to traverse that they have been seen by relatively few people.

The Green River is the largest tributary of the Colorado and brings to that river nearly one-half of the water flowing in the stretch just below the junction. The mean annual runoff of the Green from a drainage area of nearly 45,000 square miles is about 5,700,000 acre-feet; the mean annual runoff from a drainage area of 26,500 square miles of the Colorado above the Green is about 6,800,000 acre-feet. Although its drainage basin is more than 70 percent greater than that of the Colorado above the junction, the runoff of the Green is somewhat smaller because of the relatively low precipitation on much of the basin. It is far larger than any other tributary of the Colorado, the next in size being the San Juan, which has a mean annual runoff of somewhat more than 2,500,000 acre-feet.

The drainage basin of the Green, situated in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, ranges in altitude from more than 15,000 feet in the summits of the mountains to about 3,900 feet in the valley at its mouth. The average annual precipitation on the basin ranges from perhaps 50 inches or more near the summits of the high mountains to 6 inches or less in the southern valleys. The runoff from tributaries ranges from perhaps 30 inches or more in depth in the high mountain areas to a small fraction of an inch in the driest valleys.

Within the basin of the Green are mountain valleys that have excellent stands of timber, broad fertile valleys that are irrigated in part, excellent rangelands for stock, and vast areas of mountains and valleys that are essentially of desert character. Within it also are large deposits of phosphate rock, extensive coalfields which yield valuable bituminous coals, and vast areas of oil shales. Oilfields that may have considerable future importance may yet be discovered here. The population in 1920 was largely engaged in agriculture and devoted principally to producing forage crops and raising stock.

The basin is traversed by two transcontinental railroads—the Union Pacific-Oregon Short Line system and the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad. It is penetrated also from the east by the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad (Moffat line). Two transcontinental highway routes also cross the basin, one by way of Green River, Wyo., and the other by way of Green River, Utah. Many highways of lesser importance make a large part of the basin reasonably accessible.

Because of resources in agricultural lands, in water for their irrigation, and for the development of power, and in the possibilities of producing electric power from coal and oil, the future growth of the region will doubtless be largely rural but in part urban, based on agriculture and industry. Water will be needed in large quantities as an important if not a controlling factor in such growth, in agriculture for irrigation; in the production of electric energy, for use through the turbines of water-power plants and through the condensers of steam-power plants; in manufacturing, for many industrial processes; and in the present and future towns and cities for domestic and municipal uses.

The ultimate area of land that may be irrigated in the basin of the Green River is estimated at 1,782,800 acres. There are four principal irrigable sections. The basin of the upper Green River in Wyoming, in which there is an estimated irrigable area of 755,000 acres, is all above 5,800 feet in altitude. Its agricultural possibilities are, therefore, limited to the forage crops needed for winter feeding to the great herds of stock that graze within the mountain valleys of the upper basin. The Yampa and White River Basins, in Colorado, have irrigable areas estimated at 467,400 acres, ranging in altitude from 5,000 to 8,000 feet and, therefore, utilized largely for producing forage crops. The Uinta basin in Utah, having an estimated irrigable area of 295,000 acres, lies at 5,000 to 6,000 feet above sea level, and forage crops predominate there. The lower Green River Basin, including the valleys of the Price and San Rafael Rivers, contains an estimated irrigable area of 265,400 acres. These lands, which are situated farther south and at lower altitudes, have a greater range in agricultural products than the other three irrigable sections.

Only 1,850 horsepower of water power is now developed in the basin of the Green River. The total of undeveloped water power, 760,000 horsepower, is more impressive. In general the undeveloped power sites are situated wholly or in part on public lands, and permits or licenses for their use may be obtained from the Federal Power Commis-

sion under the terms of the Federal Water Power Act, approved June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063).

The probable future uses of water within the basin of the Green River will not exhaust the supply. With the irrigable areas of the basin fully developed a large quantity of water will still be discharged by the Green into the Colorado and will be available for producing power in the long stretch of canyons below the mouth of the Green and for irrigating agricultural lands in the great valleys situated in Arizona, California, and New Mexico below the Grand Canyon.

Many excellent sites for constructing storage reservoirs are situated on the Green River and its tributaries. These sites will have great value both for local utilization and for equalizing the flow of the Colorado River below the mouth of the Green. Thereby the importance of the Green River is greatly increased, and its future large utilization for agriculture and industry is made probable.

The broad aspects of the Green River have been known by white men for nearly a century. Hunters and trappers penetrated into its basin in the early part of the last century, but until the migration and settlement in Utah of Mormons in 1847 and subsequent years, and the discovery of gold in California in 1848, followed by the overland rush of gold hunters to that State in 1849-50, relatively few white men had seen the river in any part of its course. Two great overland trails used in the migrations to California and Utah crossed the Green River—one in Wyoming near the site of the present town of Green River, Wyo., and one near the site of the present town of Green River, Utah. As would be expected, a few adventurers who came to the river at these crossings attempted navigation, but the canyons and rapids in the Green River between these two places and in the Colorado River below the mouth of the Green were so dangerous that transportation by boats was found to be impracticable.

A few men have succeeded in putting boats through or around all the rapids of the Green River. Powell started his bold trip through the canyons of the Colorado at Green River, Wyo., in 1869 and so traversed all the canyons of the Green as well as those of the Colorado. A few other adventurers, explorers, or scientists have followed him, as outlined in this report. The canyons were accurately mapped in 1922, when a party of topographers, geologists, and hydraulic engineers of the United States Geological Survey carried instrumental surveys from Green River, Wyo., to Green River, Utah. Mr. Woolley, the author of this report, was attached to that party as hydraulic engineer.

Mr. Woolley is a resident of Utah who has spent his engineering life on problems related to the development of the resources of the region. In studying projects for developing waterpower and irrigation within the Green River Basin, he has visited all the principal power sites and agricultural valleys. He has traversed the river by boat from Green River, Wyo., to Green River, Utah, through the beautiful and dangerous canyons that are rarely seen by man. He has, of course, made use of all available pertinent information collected by the personnel of the Geological Survey and others over a period of many years. His basis of information is therefore the best that could be obtained at this time. He speaks with authority and from first-hand knowledge, and his report has a value that could be obtained only by thorough familiarity with the river and its possibilities of utilization.

In this report, Mr. Woolley has presented the available physical facts that are related to the present and future utilization of the Green River and his estimates of the probable ultimate development and waterpower sites and irrigable lands. His conclusions

are given without bias for particular schemes or projects. The facts will serve to guide stable growth in industry and agriculture; the estimates represent a probable measure of ultimate regional development. Similar facts and estimates for the Colorado above the mouth of the Green are contained in Water-Supply Paper 617, Upper Colorado River and Its Utilization, by Robert Follansbee, and for the Colorado below the mouth of the Green in Water-Supply Paper 556, Water Power and Flood Control of Colorado River below Green River, Utah, by E. C. LaRue. These three reports are supplementary to Water-Supply Paper 395, Colorado River and Its Utilization, by E. C. LaRue, which contained the facts related to the whole basin that were available at the time of its publication, in 1916. In the intervening years much of the river has been accurately surveyed, and additional records of discharge have been made. Because of the more complete information on which they are based, the three recent reports, Water-Supply Papers 556, 617, and 618, are more satisfactory in presentation and conclusions than the earlier report. The fundamental data presented in them are essential to stable regional development, and their compilation and publication in usable form will serve to promote proper utilization of the rivers and other natural resources contained within the drainage basin.

Mr. Woolley has not attempted to carry his study to such a degree of detail as to show to what extent a comprehensive plan of development of the Colorado River as a whole may involve correlation of development on the Green River, but he has presented basic information whereby this question may be considered by others.

The determinations of undeveloped power for this report are based somewhat arbitrarily on two time elements: (1) The capacity available 90 percent of the time, or that available during ordinary low stages and for so great a part of the time that comparatively little pondage will render it thoroughly reliable; (2) the capacity available 50 percent of the time, or that available when conditions of flow are such that, although development is ordinarily warranted, substantial storage regulation or auxiliary steam power must be provided to render the capacity thoroughly reliable. The power sites included in this report are treated only as physical possibilities, without strict regard to economic feasibility. Some of the sites that are physically possible are obviously unattractive in the economic sense, but those that are included in the report are believed to be the most attractive ones in the different basins. Accordingly they form a basis of comparison which shows the relative value of the power resources.

The 50 sites that were investigated are estimated to be capable of furnishing with the existing streamflow about 51,780 horsepower for 90 percent of the time or 83,565 horsepower for 50 percent of the time. With regulated flow the total would be about 759,600 horsepower. The Green River and Yampa River sites are considered only with regulated flow.

RELATIVE VALUE OF STREAMS FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

The accepted principle in the States in which the Green River Basin lies is that the different uses to which the water of the streams may be put are classified in order of their importance as (1) domestic, (2) irrigation, and (3) power and other industrial uses. Economic conditions play an important part in the development of the water resources of the West, and it is recognized by many that more flexible rules should be applied to the use of the streams. It is conceded, of course, that domestic use should always come first, but power and irrigation uses are likely to be of coordinate importance, and both should be encouraged where-

ever possible. If conditions are such that the power value of a stream is greater economically than its irrigation value, development of its power should be encouraged by removal of all restrictions that would tend to preclude such development.

GREEN RIVER CANYONS—GENERAL FEATURES

The Green River in its course through the Uinta Mountains and the high plateaus to the south flows in alternate stretches of narrow canyons and small valleys called parks. The stream attracted little attention as a great natural resource until recent years. It first became a subject of careful study only as it might affect the regimen of the lower Colorado River.

Water was first diverted from the Colorado River into the Imperial Valley for irrigation in 1901, and the use for this purpose grew rapidly thereafter. It was immediately realized, however, that some protection against floods on the lower river should be provided if this irrigation development were to be preserved. Accordingly searches were instituted for storage sites to control the river, and in 1904 a preliminary report was made to the United States Bureau of Reclamation calling attention to Browns Park, on the Green River, as a possible reservoir site. Immediately after this report was submitted a plane-table survey was made of the park area and its capacity as a reservoir determined. The dam site was located in the head of the canyon of Lodore, and during 1907-08 more than \$43,000 was spent by the Bureau of Reclamation in drilling explorations at two proposed dam sites. The results of these operations were not encouraging, and further investigations were made for other reservoir sites. A survey was made of the Flaming Gorge site in 1914. Soon afterward diamond drilling was done at the proposed dam sites in Horseshoe Canyon. Two sites were drilled, one about 4,000 feet above the mouth of the canyon and the other about 500 feet farther up. At the upper site 15 holes were drilled, at the lower site 6, and on the saddle above the Horseshoe Canyon 4. Further work was done here by the Utah Power & Light Co. in 1923-26 and is described in detail in the section on the Flaming Gorge power site.

After the survey of the Flaming Gorge reservoir site an attempt was made in 1916 to find a suitable dam site in the upper part of Desolation Canyon that could be used to create a huge reservoir of the Green River Valley in Uinta Basin. Several of the most promising cross sections in the canyon were surveyed. A topographic survey of the reservoir itself had already been made for private persons by Guy Sterling, an engineer. About this time the stream began to attract so much interest as a source of power as to induce the Utah Power & Light Co. to spend considerable money in making a topographic survey of a stretch of the river extending through part of Desolation and Gray Canyons and reconnaissance investigations of the power possibilities of the canyon stretches between Flaming Gorge and Uinta Basin. In this way there became available several maps of different stretches of the river. They were all independent of one another, and there was no complete map of the river as a whole. Accordingly in 1922 the Geological Survey, in cooperation with the Utah Power & Light Co., made a complete map, correlating the surveys that were available and filling in the stretches for which there were no surveys. The results of this survey are published by the Geological Survey under the title, "Plan and profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo.," consisting of 16 sheets—10 plans and 6 profiles. These may be obtained from the Director of the Geological Survey at \$1.60 for the set.

When survey data became available for the Colorado River through its lower canyons storage possibilities were found large enough to afford complete regulation of the flow of

the river into its lower valley, and the sites on the Green River were abandoned, except the one at Flaming Gorge, which has now been completely investigated as a power site under preliminary permit 165 of the Federal Power Commission.

In discussing the power sites in this report it is not intended to advocate the development of the river as here outlined, but merely to suggest a plan that seems to fit into the general topographic conditions without undue disturbance to agricultural developments along the stream. Obviously, it is impossible to say that suitable foundation conditions for dams will be found at any of these suggested sites where no drilling has been done. Accordingly some of them may prove infeasible after careful investigation, or some others not here suggested may prove to be better fitted into market and economic conditions.

CONDITIONS SUGGESTING PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

With a dam in Horseshoe Canyon complete regulation of the flow of the river at that place is possible. This is, of course, a very desirable result, because the regulated flow would then be available at all the power sites down the river.

To develop the fall through Red Canyon a dam is suggested near mile 285 of the river survey, because of the narrow cross section there and the fact that a dam of moderate height could be used to develop the entire fall between that locality and the Flaming Gorge site in Horseshoe Canyon.

The Swallow Canyon site is suggested in place of one near the upper end of the Canyon of Lodore, because the drillings made by the Bureau of Reclamation at the latter site disclose unattractive foundation conditions, which add materially to the engineering difficulties of the project, because the dam site is from 1 to 3 miles down the canyon, a narrow rock gorge with almost vertical walls nearly half a mile high. Furthermore, the reservoir that would be created would not be needed after the Flaming Gorge project is built and would only add to depletion of the streamflow by evaporation as well as inundate additional ranch lands in Browns Park.

With a dam at the head of Whirlpool Canyon, which is here suggested as the Echo Park site, advantage would be gained of the combined flow of the Green and Yampa Rivers, and it is believed that with the streams already regulated at developments above sufficient additional regulation would be created by this dam to take care of the inflow below the other points of regulation. The Canyon of Lodore would be the reservoir, and no serious inundation of lands in Browns Park would result. Evaporation losses would be a minimum, because of the narrowness of the canyon, the average width of the proposed reservoir surface being only about 600 feet. However, it would be about 30 miles long and have an estimated capacity of 200,000 acre-feet, about half of which could be used for stream regulation with a drawdown of 50 feet at the dam.

The Split Mountain site is at the lower end of the Green River Canyon through the Uinta Mountains. It contemplates by creating storage in Island Park the use of the total regulated flow of the Green River at this point. Here the river enters the open valley of the Uinta Basin, and for a distance of more than 80 miles it meanders through the valley with an average fall of less than 2 feet to the mile.

It is this valley that would be inundated by the proposed Ouray Reservoir, for which dam-site surveys were made at several sections in the upper end of Desolation Canyon. The building of this reservoir would completely control the Green River at this place, but it would inundate considerable improved agricultural land and serve no material benefit other than contribute to regulation of the lower Colorado River. No suitable dam site was found.

The fall in Desolation and Gray Canyons below Uinta Basin and the topography of the canyon suggest two developments, and these are selected with the view of utilizing the power of the stream with due regard to the agricultural possibilities along it in the Uinta Basin. They are described below.

FLAMING GORGE POWER SITE

Location: The Flaming Gorge power site is on the Green River just south of the Wyoming-Utah line. The dam site is in the upper end of Horseshoe Canyon, in the SW. ¼ sec. 31, T. 3 N., R. 21 E., Salt Lake base and meridian.

Physical characteristics: Horseshoe Canyon is a narrow gorge with massive sandstone walls, in many places almost vertical. (See pl. 31, A.) In August 1923, a preliminary permit was issued to the Utah Power & Light Co. by the Federal Power Commission for the development of this site. Under this permit more than 20 drill holes were sunk in Horseshoe Canyon and 10 in Flaming Gorge. Bedrock was found in Flaming Gorge at depths of 40 to 45 feet and in Horseshoe Canyon at depths ranging from 50 feet at the upper end of the canyon to 73 feet at the lower end. As a result of these investigations and studies of cross sections at many places the dam site above indicated was chosen as best suited for the proposed development. At this section the average altitude of low water is 5,839 feet above sea level and a dam with its crest at 6,065 feet would have a crest length of 875 feet.

ECHO PARK POWER SITE

Location: The Echo Park Dam site is at the head of Whirlpool Canyon, just where the river leaves Echo Park. It is about 3 miles down the river from the mouth of the Yampa River.

Physical characteristics: At this site the river is in a narrow box canyon in the Uinta quartzite. The distance between the walls at the water surface is 150 feet, and a dam to raise the water 300 feet would be 600 feet long on the top.

Plan of development: A development such as that proposed at the Flaming Gorge site is also suggested at this site.

Water supply: At this site the flow of the Green River is augmented by that of the Yampa River, and it is estimated that with each of the streams regulated above a flow of 4,950 second-feet would be available here. The Canyon of Lodore and the Blue Mountain Canyon on the Yampa River would form a reservoir. The backwater would extend up each of the streams about 29½ miles and create storage capacity of about 575,000 acre-feet. The Sand Draw and Johnson Draw dam sites, on the Yampa River, would both be flooded.

Power capacity: The static head at the Echo Park site would probably fluctuate from 280 to 300 feet, allowing the top 20 feet of the reservoir to be used for regulation of the inflow into it below other points of regulation. With an average static head of 290 feet and a stream flow of 4,950 second-feet the power capacity of the site is 114,800 horsepower (86,100 kilowatts). All future irrigation use of the streams above this site will probably never reduce this capacity as much as 15 percent.

Right of way: No valuable agricultural lands would be flooded by this project.

Accessibility: The site is accessible with difficulty. It is remote from any railroad transportation and would require expensive road construction to connect it with any present highway.

SPLIT MOUNTAIN POWER SITE

Location: The Split Mountain power site is about 1 mile above the lower end of Split Mountain Canyon, about 9 miles northeast of Jensen, Utah, just below mile 201 of the Green River survey.

Physical characteristics: The river at this dam site has cut its channel into the Weber

sandstone. This rock is hard and dense and is considered satisfactory for the foundation and abutment walls of a dam.

Plan of development: The same type of development as that proposed at the Flaming Gorge site is adaptable for this site. The dam here would have a length of 150 feet at the water surface (altitude 4,800 feet) and a crest length of 1,000 feet at a height of 250 feet (altitude 5,050 feet). Another plan has been suggested, however, as a combination irrigation and power development. This plan contemplates a tunnel from a point immediately above the proposed dam extending almost due south to Red Wash. This tunnel, if taken out at an altitude of 4,900 feet, would be about 1 mile long, and a penstock from its outlet to the river near the mouth of Red Wash would be 1½ miles long. This would cut off about 12 miles of the river course and gain an additional head of 65 feet, adding about 25,500 horsepower to the capacity of the site after due allowance is made for irrigating about 12,000 acres of land to the west and south of the tunnel outlet. The large tunnel and pressure pipe necessary to handle 5,100 second-feet of water would add considerably to the cost of the development, but the irrigation feature may add to the attractiveness of the project when further irrigation development is needed in that locality. A small tunnel for the irrigation project might be more feasible. It has also been proposed that water be diverted from the Green River here to supply the Deadmans Bench irrigation project, which lies on both sides of the Colorado-Utah line to the southeast. This plan, however, was investigated by the Bureau of Reclamation and determined to be economically infeasible.

Water supply: From an analysis of the stream-flow records on the Green River at Little Valley, Ouray, Jensen, and Bridgeport, it is estimated that an equalized flow at the Split Mountain power site of about 5,100 second-feet is possible with the regulation provided by the other developments above and the storage that would be created behind this dam.

Power capacity: If the top 50 feet of the storage behind the dam is allowed for regulation the average static head would be 225 feet. With a flow of 5,100 second-feet the power capacity would be 91,800 horsepower (68,850 kilowatts). Ultimate irrigation use of the streams above this site will probably not decrease this capacity in excess of 15 percent.

Right of way: Development as here suggested would inundate Island Park, a part of which is used for ranching.

Accessibility: The dam site is not difficultly accessible from towns in the Uinta Basin, but it is remote from railroad transportation.

Waterpower sites on Green River between Green River, Wyo., and Green River, Utah ¹

Name of power site	Static head (feet)	Estimated regulated streamflow (second-feet)	Power capacity (horsepower)
Flaming Gorge.....	² 196	2, 620	41, 000
Red Canyon.....	266	2, 720	57, 900
Swallow Canyon.....	195	2, 740	34, 700
Echo Park ³	² 290	4, 950	114, 800
Split Mountain.....	² 225	5, 100	91, 800
Rock Creek.....	² 180	7, 000	100, 000
Rattlesnake.....	275	7, 000	154, 000
Total.....			594, 200

¹ Backwater from either the Dark Canyon or the junction power developments as described in Water Supply Paper 556, pp. 47-49, would extend to the town of Green River, Utah. For this reason the utilization of that stretch of the river below the town is not considered in detail in this report.

² Average head.
³ Development of the Echo Park site would flood the Sand Draw and Johnson Draw Dam sites on the Yampa River.

Water powers of Green River Basin

RECAPITULATION

Minor drainage basin	Number of power sites	Horsepower			
		With existing flow		With regulated flow	
		0.08H×Q90	0.08H×Q50	0.08H×Q90	0.08H×Q50
Upper Green River Basin.....	9	1,530	1,933	11,100	-----
Yampa and White River Basins.....	9	17,150	17,460	86,500	-----
Uinta Basin exclusive of Green River.....	16	37,170	59,088	49,622	78,334
Lower Green River Basin.....	9	5,930	10,084	18,190	-----
Green River canyons.....	7	-----	-----	594,200	-----
Total.....	50	51,780	88,565	759,612	78,344

¹ Includes Cross Mountain site and sites on small streams. Other sites on main stream considered only with stream regulation.

² Does not include Sand Draw and Johnson Draw sites, as these would be flooded by development of Echo Park site on Green River.

RELATIVE VALUE OF STREAMS FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

In the arid region the question how the streams may be used to best advantage is one that becomes more serious as the use of the water increases. One of the fundamental conditions involved in the question is the accepted principle that the different uses to which the water may be put are classified in order of their importance as (1) domestic, (2) irrigation, and (3) power and other industrial uses. In the early stages of development along the streams there is usually plenty of water and no difficulty attendant upon its use, but as the number of users increases and communities become dependent upon the streams for their water supply the problem becomes more and more complicated.

It is, of course, obvious that domestic use should have a preferred right, and it is also obvious that in communities where local irrigation is of primary importance in the production of the community's food supplies that, too, should have a preferred right. But there are few communities now that are solely dependent upon their own products for food. Only a little more than half of the food supply for the farms in the intermontane region is now produced on the farms, and in many places it is even cheaper to obtain foodstuffs by parcel post or freight than it is to produce them there. This condition has greatly changed the economic aspect of farming in the arid region where irrigation is necessary, and it has likewise affected, in some localities at least, the economic value of water rights for irrigation.

Throughout the arid region the cheaply constructed irrigation projects in climates adapted for general farming are all built, and the time when the more expensive ones will become economically feasible has been pushed farther into the future by increased transportation facilities and more efficient farming methods. Agriculture, including irrigation, was the basis upon which practically all the permanent communities of the arid West have been built, and some of these are still solely dependent upon this industry for their existence, but others have added different forms of industry such as mining and manufacturing.

The communities supported by irrigated lands are beyond doubt more stable than those subject to the ups and downs of prosperity that are not uncommon to other industries, and for this reason public opinion in the West places irrigation use of the streams superior to all other uses except domestic.

It is a somewhat common practice to measure the future growth of the arid West in terms of the total runoff of the streams and the area of undeveloped land, without any regard to the economic factor involved in the problem. However, the fallacy of such

a criterion is very rapidly becoming apparent. The fact is now recognized that new problems must be solved in irrigation development to meet the profound changes that are reshaping our economic and social structure. Further irrigation development should be made only as economic needs demand, if it is to become permanently successful. This fact, however, seems to be entirely overlooked by those who wish to see every arable acre developed, and the result is that other uses of streams, such as power, are regarded as subject for all time to any proposed future demands for irrigation development, regardless of economic feasibility and without consideration of the relative economic value of the two uses. This attitude may preclude the use of a stream for power, as it may involve the water rights for that use in so much uncertainty as to make the power capacity too small to be attractive and also add to the difficulties of financing the project. In view of these conditions, each stream should be considered as an individual problem, and its utilization might properly be worked out according to the most comprehensive plan, based upon the weighted economic values of the various uses. Power now has a place in modern agriculture. Electricity has become the servant of the farmer and is the means by which he is enabled to do several times the work that he could do a few years ago.

EXHIBIT 4

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
December 13, 1934.

The DIRECTOR,
National Park Service.

DEAR DIRECTOR CAEMMERER: Reference is made to Acting Director Demaray's letter of August 9, 1934, in which the Commission was advised that you were studying the possibility of establishing a national monument along the Green and Yampa Rivers, in northwestern Colorado, which would embrace lands withdrawn for the proposed Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments included in the application for preliminary permit of the Utah Power & Light Co., designated as project No. 279.

Assurance was given in the letter that the Presidential proclamation establishing such a monument would exempt all existing rights, including power withdrawals, but a statement was added that if it were possible to release the power withdrawals the "monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration." This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation

and power possibilities on the Upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by Power Site Reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and Power Site Classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site is estimated at 130,000 horsepower. This is based on the development of a head of 310 feet at the dam and a regulated flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second obtained by storage in the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir on Green River and Juniper Mountain Reservoir on Yampa River. At Blue Mountain the primary capacity is estimated at 19,000 horsepower based on the development of 210 feet of head and a regulated flow of 1,100 cubic feet per second.

Ralf R. Woolley in his report on Green River and its utilization (Water Supply Paper No. 618, U. S. Geological Survey), proposes the development of 114,800 horsepower, primary capacity, at the Echo Park site, based on an average head of 290 feet and a streamflow of 4,950 cubic feet per second. At Johnson's Draw, which is his designation for the Blue Mountain site, Mr. Woolley proposes a primary capacity of 43,200 horsepower based on a regulated flow of 1,800 cubic feet per second and a head of 300 feet. Either of these estimates would justify installations of something like 300,000 horsepower at Echo Park and at least 50,000 horsepower at Blue Mountain.

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1.5 million to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the greater part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of these streams.

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.

I enclose a copy of the portion of the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. which describes the proposed development, and blueprints of exhibits H (a), H (b), and H (c) showing the location of the various units of the plan, river profiles, and cross sections of the dam sites. The Commission has no special reports on the area under consideration, but if you are not already familiar with them, it is suggested that you obtain the following publications of the Geological Survey:

Water supply paper No. 618 (previously referred to).

Plan and profile of Yampa River, Colo., from Green River to Morgan Gulch (5 sheets showing river profile and topography and 1 sheet of special dam-site surveys).

Plan and profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo. (16 sheets, 10 plans, and 6 profiles).

Yours very cordially,

FRANK R. MCNINCH,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 5

EXCERPTS FROM THE COLORADO RIVER, A DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR REPORT, DATED MARCH 1946

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

31. Ultimate development of the water resources of the Colorado River will involve the investigation and construction of such projects as will fully utilize for irrigation, power production, flood control, and other beneficial purposes all the water in the Colorado River system available to the United States. Looking toward the formulation of a plan for comprehensive development, this report presents for consideration 134 potential projects or units of projects, mostly multiple purpose, for use of water within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River. Potential projects for the export of water from the Colorado River Basin to adjacent basins are also discussed. The inventory of potential projects in this report and substantiating material is intended to be of use in the selection of projects which will comprise ultimately the final comprehensive plan. It is not intended that the listing of projects in this report will preclude the consideration of others that additional investigations may show to be desirable. In the formulation of the ultimate plan, however, consideration must also be given the possibilities for expanding projects now existing or authorized. Because of the limited water supply, it is not possible for all the potential projects to be constructed and for all the existing or authorized projects to be expanded to the possible extent of their ultimate potentialities. Each development can deplete the stream flow only insofar as permitted by the Colorado River compact and other legal limitations. The formulation of an ultimate plan of river development, therefore, will require selection from among the possibilities for expanding existing or authorized projects as well as from among the potential new projects. Before such a selection of projects can be made it will be necessary that the seven Colorado River Basin States agree upon their respective rights to deplete the water supply of the Colorado River or that the courts apportion available water among them. Each State also will need to select from the potential projects within its boundaries those it desires to have constructed to consume its allocation of water. The many decisions and selections to be made require a vast background of factual information. To assist the States in the selection of projects the several agencies which have prepared this report stand ready to make available their consultative services and all information presently at hand. A great amount of engineering and economic investigational work has been required to assemble and evaluate the information from which has been prepared this inventory of potential projects. Detailed information is available for a substantial number of potential developments and only data of a reconnaissance nature for others, but from all the information available it should be possible, prior to a final settlement of water rights, to select a group of projects which are urgently needed, or which will be key units of the comprehensive plan for construction as the next stage of the development.

32. Although there would be enough water in the river system to serve all of the 134 within-basin projects or units of projects if no further exportation of water is made, it may be found more economical and the States may elect to forego construction

of some irrigation projects within the natural drainage basin in order to make water available for exportation to adjacent watersheds within the basin States. When final allocations of water are made, moreover, some States may be unable to use their full amount unless part is exported. Power projects do not consume water except by evaporation from power reservoirs, but most of these reservoirs serve multiple purposes and are required for full river regulation and control.

33. If all the 134 within-basin potential projects or units of projects were constructed, they would deplete the flow of the Colorado River by more than 6 million acre-feet annually. New possibilities exist for the exportation of an additional 3 million acre-feet annually to areas outside the natural drainage basin but within the boundaries of the Colorado River Basin States, as permitted by the Colorado River compact. If all existing or authorized projects were constructed to the possible extent of their ultimate potentialities, they would increase present depletion by approximately 4 million acre-feet. With present uses depleting the stream by about 7 million acre-feet, the total depletions would aggregate more than 20 million acre-feet, or about 25 percent more than the estimated amount of water

available. Predominant among existing or authorized projects which could be further developed are those in the lower basin made possible by the construction of Boulder Dam. Possible future development of these enterprises would increase present river depletions by about 3,600,000 acre-feet annually, of which 2,800,000 acre-feet would be used in California outside the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River and the remainder would be consumed in Arizona or California or lost by reservoir evaporation. In the upper basin completion of existing or authorized transmountain diversion projects would further deplete the river by 474,000 acre-feet annually and expansion of within-basin projects would cause a depletion of 82,000 acre-feet.

34. The depletory effect on stream flow of all within-basin and export diversion projects, including existing or authorized projects and potential projects, is shown in table 1. The depletion shown under existing or authorized projects include present depletions resulting from projects in operation and possible depletions which would result from the extension of existing projects or the construction of authorized projects. Depletions are shown for the 134 potential within-basin projects and for the new export diversion possibilities.

TABLE I.—Present and potential stream depletions in the Colorado River Basin

Basin and State	Estimated average annual depletion (acre-feet) ¹			
	Existing or authorized projects		Potential projects	Total ultimate depletion
	Present depletion	Possible increase		
Upper basin:				
Arizona.....	10,200		39,000	49,200
Colorado.....	1,231,300	507,000	2,522,000	4,260,300
New Mexico.....	68,400		450,000	518,400
Utah.....	515,900	32,000	1,462,700	2,010,600
Wyoming.....	374,000	17,000	576,000	967,000
Main stem reservoir losses.....			831,000	831,000
Pasture irrigation.....	(2)	(2)	500,000	500,000
Subtotal.....	2,199,800	556,000	6,380,700	9,136,500
Lower basin:				
Arizona.....	1,407,200	571,000	2,015,400	3,993,600
California.....	2,680,000	2,946,000	176,000	5,802,000
Nevada.....	43,800		213,000	256,800
New Mexico.....	29,000		8,000	37,000
Utah.....	45,000		56,300	101,300
Main stem reservoir losses.....	713,000	66,000	91,000	870,000
Subtotal.....	4,918,000	3,583,000	2,559,700	11,060,700
Total.....	7,117,800	4,139,000	8,940,400	20,197,200

NOTE.—Average flow available for depletion in the United States, 16,220,000 acre-feet.

¹ Includes both uses within the natural basin and export diversions to adjacent watersheds.

² Included in depletions shown by States.

POTENTIAL PROJECTS

35. The 134 projects or units of projects included in the inventory of potential projects for development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin are all located within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River, 100 in the upper basin and 34 in the lower basin. These within-basin potential projects considered as a group indicate in general the ultimate potentialities of future development. For that reason these projects are summarized in the following paragraphs. If similar basin reports for adjoining basins or individual project reports indicate the need and desirability for exporting water from the natural drainage basin for use within the Colorado River Basin States, as permitted by the Colorado River Compact, this would result in a corresponding reduction of within-basin uses. New possibilities for exportation of water to adjoining watersheds, such as the Blue River-South Platte and Gunnison-Arkansas projects in Colorado and the central Utah project in Utah, are mentioned in the substantiating material but are not tabulated and

summarized in the inventory of potential projects presented in this report.

36. If all of these 134 projects or units of projects should be constructed they would benefit 2,656,230 acres of land, 1,734,980 acres in the upper basin and 921,250 acres in the lower basin. Of this total 1,533,960 acres would be new land brought into cultivation, 1,230,810 acres in the upper basin and 303,150 acres in the lower basin, and 1,122,270 acres of inadequately irrigated land would be furnished a supplemental supply, 504,170 acres in the upper basin and 618,100 acres in the lower basin. (See par. 41, table III.) In addition to these lands vast areas of natural pasture lands in the upper basin would produce more abundantly under irrigation. These pasture lands, located mostly on gentle mountain slopes, have not been surveyed and consequently specific projects have not been planned to bring water to them, but in summarizing potentialities for new developments an ultimate river depletion of 500,000 acre-feet annually has been allowed for pasture irrigation.

37. These potential projects include 38

hydroelectric power plants with a total installed capacity of more than 3,500,000 kilowatts. (See par. 41, table IV.) Twenty-nine of the plants would be in the upper basin, mostly on tributary streams. The combined installed capacities of the upper basin plants would total 1,713,000 kilowatts and the annual energy output 9.2 billion kilowatt-hours.

This is more than the anticipated requirement for power in the upper basin and would leave some for transmission to adjacent areas. The 9 new plants outlined for the lower basin would have installed capacities totaling 1,945,400 kilowatts and would produce 10.2 billion kilowatt-hours of additional energy a year. This would satisfy all expected demands in the lower basin and the adjacent west coast power market area until 1960, at which time additional power developments would be required to meet growing demands. The potential power output in both the up-

per and lower basins could be maintained substantially even with full development of the river system for irrigation and other purposes.

38. Potential power and irrigation reservoirs would make a substantial contribution to flood control in the basin, but the extent of that contribution cannot, of course, be determined until the projects to be constructed have been selected. Some of these reservoirs would permit use of a greater part of Lake Mead's capacity for irrigation storage and power production.

39. Reservoirs provided for irrigation, power production, or flood control would have incidental value for fishing, boating, and other recreational purposes. Reservoirs could be operated to maintain or improve the fishing in mountain streams. Specific projects are described which would furnish municipal supplies to Tucson, Ariz., and the Grand Valley area in Colorado. Future water

requirements for growing municipalities and industries could be provided as needs arise. Many of the reservoirs would have storage capacity for retention of silt and mitigate that menace for a great many years to come.

40. Construction of all these potential projects for use of water in the natural drainage basin, including transmission grids, is estimated to cost \$2,185,442,000 with expenditures divided \$930,142,000 in the upper basin and \$1,255,300,000 in the lower basin. These preliminary estimates are based on costs as of January 1940.

41. These 134 potential projects or units of projects, together with their locations, sources of water supply, purposes to be served, and estimated construction costs are listed in table II. Potential irrigation and power developments that would result from the construction of these projects are summarized in tables III and IV, respectively.

TABLE II.—Potential projects in the Colorado River Basin

Project and unit	Location of project	Source of water supply	Purpose to be served ¹	Estimated construction cost ²
UPPER BASIN				
Sublette.....	Wyoming.....	Green River.....	I, F, P.....	\$36,500,000
West Side.....	do.....	do.....	I, F.....	
Daniel.....	do.....	do.....	I, F.....	
Elkhorn.....	do.....	do.....	I, F, P.....	
Paradise.....	do.....	New Fork River.....	I.....	
Eden.....	do.....	Big Sandy Creek.....	I.....	
Lower Big Sandy.....	do.....	do.....	I.....	
LaBarge.....	do.....	LaBarge Creek.....	I, F.....	
Fontenelle.....	do.....	Fontenelle Creek.....	I, F.....	
Seedskaadee.....	do.....	Green River.....	I.....	
Opal.....	do.....	Hams Fork.....	I, F.....	3,600,000
Lynnan.....	do.....	Blacks Fork, Smiths Fork.....	I, F.....	4,330,000
Henrys Fork.....	Wyoming, Utah.....	Henrys Fork.....	I, F.....	1,470,000
Flaming Gorge.....	do.....	Green River.....	P, F, H, S.....	10,000,000
Red Canyon.....	Utah.....	do.....	P, F.....	4,100,000
Little Snake River.....	Wyoming, Colorado.....	Little Snake River tributaries.....	I, P, F.....	21,500,000
Upper Yampa.....	Colorado.....	Yampa River.....	I, F.....	2,300,000
Wessels.....	do.....	do.....	I, F.....	1,100,000
Mount Harris.....	do.....	Tributaries of Yampa River.....	I, F.....	3,300,000
Great Northern.....	do.....	Elkhead Creek and Elk River.....	I, F.....	2,700,000
Yellow Jacket.....	do.....	White River and Milk Creek.....	I, F.....	4,700,000
Deadman Bench.....	Colorado, Utah.....	Yampa River.....	I, P, F, H, S.....	23,800,000
Maybell.....	Colorado.....	do.....	I.....	700,000
Cross Mountain.....	do.....	do.....	P.....	5,000,000
Lily Park.....	do.....	do.....	P, F.....	1,900,000
Josephine Basin.....	do.....	do.....	I.....	300,000
Piceance.....	do.....	Piceance Creek.....	I, F.....	800,000
Moon Lake Extension.....	Utah.....	Duchesne River and tributary.....	I, F.....	7,900,000
Fruitland.....	do.....	Red Creek.....	I, F.....	400,000
Castle Peak.....	do.....	Duchesne River.....	I, F.....	5,300,000
Mosby.....	do.....	Deep Creek, Whitetocks River.....	I, F.....	1,100,000
Vernal.....	do.....	Ashley Creek.....	I, F.....	1,500,000
Jensen.....	do.....	Brush Creek.....	I, F.....	300,000
Minnie Maud.....	do.....	Minnie Maud Creek.....	I, F.....	100,000
Green River Pumping.....	do.....	Green River.....	I.....	400,000
Echo Park.....	Colorado.....	do.....	P, F, H, S.....	43,000,000
Split Mountain.....	Utah.....	do.....	P, F, H, S.....	23,000,000
Emery County.....	do.....	Cottonwood Creek.....	I, F.....	2,500,000
Buckhorn.....	do.....	Huntington Creek.....	I, F.....	1,200,000
Gunnison Valley.....	do.....	Green River.....	I.....	1,100,000
Desolation Canyon.....	do.....	do.....	P, F, H.....	21,000,000
Rattlesnake Power.....	do.....	do.....	P, F, H.....	23,000,000
Troublesome.....	Colorado.....	Troublesome Creek.....	I, F.....	2,210,000
Muddy Creek.....	do.....	Muddy Creek.....	I, F.....	500,000
Gore Canyon.....	do.....	Colorado River.....	P.....	3,800,000
Fourmile.....	do.....	Fourmile Creek.....	I, F.....	600,000
Cattle Creek.....	do.....	Cattle Creek.....	I, F.....	430,000
Capitol Creek.....	do.....	Snowmass Creek.....	I.....	130,000
Woody Creek.....	do.....	Roaring Fork.....	I.....	170,000
Silt.....	do.....	Rifle Creek.....	I, F.....	1,320,000
West Divide.....	do.....	Middle Willow Creek.....	I, F.....	1,300,000
Hunter Mesa.....	do.....	Buzzard Creek.....	I, F.....	1,500,000
Poan Creek.....	do.....	Carr Creek.....	I, F.....	610,000
Colibran.....	do.....	Plateau Creek.....	I, F, M.....	1,940,000
Grand Valley Extension.....	do.....	Colorado River.....	I.....	415,000
Cisco-Thompson.....	Colorado, Utah.....	do.....	P, I, F, H, S.....	34,240,000
Tomichi Creek.....	Colorado.....	Tomichi Creek.....	I, F.....	1,860,000
Cochetopa Creek.....	do.....	Cochetopa Creek.....	I, F.....	1,150,000
Ohio Creek.....	do.....	Anthracite and Castle Creeks.....	I, F.....	1,080,000
Lake Fork.....	do.....	Lake Fork.....	P, F.....	1,300,000
Sapinero.....	do.....	Gunnison River.....	P, F.....	7,800,000
Fruitland Mesa.....	do.....	Curecane and Sapinero Creeks.....	I, F.....	3,500,000
Smith Fork.....	do.....	Smith Fork.....	I, F.....	2,200,000
Paonia.....	do.....	East Muddy Creek and North Fork.....	I, F.....	1,400,000
Minnesota.....	do.....	Minnesota Creek.....	I, F.....	820,000
Leroux Creek.....	do.....	Leroux Creek.....	I, F.....	2,800,000
Grand Mesa.....	do.....	Current, Surface, and Tongue Creeks.....	I, F.....	1,920,000
Ouray.....	do.....	Uncompahgre River.....	P, I, F.....	4,100,000
Redlands.....	do.....	Gunnison River.....	I, F.....	367,000
Saucer Valley.....	do.....	Disappointment Creek.....	I, F.....	940,000
Nucla.....	do.....	Horseshoe and Cottonwood Creeks.....	I, F.....	1,500,000
San Miguel.....	do.....	Anderson, Naturita, Dry Creeks, and San Miguel River.....	I, F.....	6,590,000
West Paradox.....	do.....	West Paradox, Deep, and Geyser Creeks.....	I, F.....	640,000
Dewey.....	Utah.....	Colorado River.....	P, F, H, S.....	38,000,000
Moab.....	do.....	do.....	P, F, H, S.....	9,900,000

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Potential projects in the Colorado River Basin—Continued

Project and unit	Location of project	Source of water supply	Purpose to be served ¹	Estimated construction cost ²
UPPER BASIN—continued				
Pack Creek	Utah	Mill Creek	I, F	\$775,000
Hatch Creek	do	Hatch Creek	I, F	400,000
Dulce-Chama-Navaho	Colorado	Navaho River	I, F	1,627,000
South San Juan	New Mexico	San Juan River	I, F	35,000,000
Carracas	Colorado	do	I	36,000
O'Neal Park	do	Piedra River	I	880,000
Hammond	New Mexico	San Juan River	I	725,000
Shiprock	do	do	I, F	21,141,000
Emerald Lake	Colorado	Pine River	P, F	6,200,000
Pine River Extension	Colorado, New Mexico	do	I	1,835,000
Florida	Colorado	Florida River	I, F	2,290,000
Animas-La Plata	Colorado, New Mexico	Animas and La Plata Rivers	I, P, F, S	63,534,000
McElmo	Colorado	McElmo Creek	I, F	390,000
Montezuma Valley Extension	do	Dolores River	I, F	1,300,000
Dolores	Colorado, Utah	do	I, F, S	12,200,000
Blanding	Utah	Recapture Creek	I, F	567,000
Navaho Indian Project	Colorado	San Juan River	I, F, S	2,910,000
Bluff	Utah	do	P, F	10,000,000
Gooseheads	do	do	P, S, F, H	5,200,000
Slick Horn Canyon	do	do	P, S, F, H	6,300,000
Great Bend	do	do	P, S, F, H	10,000,000
Fremont	do	Fremont River	I, F	800,000
Torrey	do	do	I, F	200,000
Escalante	do	Escalante River	I, F	900,000
Dark Canyon	do	Colorado River	P, F, S, H	105,000,000
Glen Canyon	Arizona	do	P, F, S, H	64,000,000
Transmission Grid				170,000,000
Subtotal, upper basin				930,142,000
LOWER BASIN				
Snowflake	Arizona	Showlow and Silver Creeks	I, F, S	2,600,000
Black Creek	do	Black Creek	I, F, S	1,800,000
Holbrook	do	Little Colorado River	I, F, S, C	1,300,000
Winslow	do	Clear and Chevelon Creeks	I, F, S	19,000,000
Kanab Creek	do	Kanab Creek	I	200,000
Hurricane	Utah, Arizona	Virgin River	I, P, S, F	9,200,000
Santa Clara	Utah	Santa Clara River	I, F, S	1,700,000
Panaca Valley	Nevada	Meadow Valley Wash	I, F	1,300,000
Moapa Valley	do	Muddy River	I, F, S	700,000
Moapa Valley Pumping	do	Lake Mead	I	2,800,000
Marble Canyon-Kanab Creek	Arizona	Colorado River	P, F, S, H	382,000,000
Cocconino	do	Little Colorado River	F, S, H	4,000,000
Bridge Canyon	do	Colorado	P, I, F, S, H	146,500,000
Virgin Bay Pumping	Nevada	Lake Mead	I	1,300,000
Las Vegas Pumping	do	do	I, M	8,400,000
Davis Reservoir Pumping	do	Davis Reservoir	I	500,000
Big Bend Pumping	do	Colorado River	I	700,000
Fort Mojave	do	do	I	800,000
Mojave Valley	Arizona	do	I	1,900,000
Alamo	do	Bill Williams River	F, P, H	3,200,000
Palo Verde Mesa	California	Colorado River	I	3,100,000
Wellton-Mohawk	Arizona	do	I	10,000,000
Sentinel	do	Gila River	F, H	15,000,000
River rectification and control	California-Arizona	Colorado River	F	5,000,000
Central Arizona	Arizona	do	I, F, P, M, U	432,800,000
Salt River				
Paradise Valley				
San Carlos				
Charleston				
Safford Valley				
San Francisco				
Duncan-Virden Valley				
New Mexico				
Chino Valley	do	Granite and Willow Creeks	I	150,000
Hassayampa	do	Hassayampa River	I, F	6,650,000
Transmission Grid				192,100,000
Subtotal, lower basin				1,255,300,000
Total, Colorado River Basin				2,185,442,000

¹ Symbols used: I=irrigation; F=flood control; P=power; H=hold-over storage for river regulation; S=silt retention; M=municipal; U=underground water recharge; C=channel improvement. In addition many potential reservoirs would have value for recreation and fish and wildlife conservation.

² Preliminary estimates based on construction costs Jan. 1, 1940.

³ Half the water required for this project would be diverted from the Gunnison River by exchange.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

54. There is need for proceeding at an early date with the construction of certain of the potential projects. In areas such as would be served by the Animas-LaPlata, Hurricane, and Snowflake projects, existing distress resulting from the lack of opportunities in irrigated agriculture should be relieved as promptly as practicable. The power markets of southern California and southern Arizona will shortly require the construction of a major hydroelectric development on the lower river; similarly, the load growth in Utah and western Colorado will require construction of power developments in the upper basin. An existing economy in the Salt and Gila River Valleys in central Arizona is

threatened with serious losses through overdraft of its water supply from underground sources. Key developments necessary in many instances before lesser developments can proceed, should be constructed at an early date in order that those dependent projects may follow in logical order and basinwide development be undertaken in stages.

55. To activate a construction program, it is suggested that the affected States decide from among the known potentialities which projects they desire to have the Bureau of Reclamation consider for construction and that such projects as are selected for construction comprise the next stage of development. The economic feasibility of the group

of projects included in this next stage of development would be comprehended in the finding of feasibility for the overall ultimate development of the basin. The group of projects should include those for which there is an immediate need and for which adequate water rights consistent with the Colorado River Compact and its associated and dependent documents are assured. As has been stated, the agencies which have prepared this report stand ready with their consultative services to assist the States in this selective process. When the next stage of development has been decided upon, it may be presented to the Congress as a program for authorization of construction.

RELATED INVESTIGATIONS

56. Various Federal agencies having an interest in development of resources in the basin have collaborated in the preparation of this report. These agencies have cooperated to the extent of funds and personnel available, and their specific comments are found in chapter VIII of the substantiating material attached.

57. The Geological Survey has furnished basic data on streamflow, ground-water supplies, quality of water, water utilization, minerals, and mapping. In order to obtain additional basic facts related to both surface water and ground water of the Colorado River Basin, the Geological Survey has outlined a 3-year investigational program estimated to cost about \$650,000 a year. The basic water facts obtained by the Geological Survey are needed for use not only in the design, construction, and operation of potential projects but also in the planning, construction, operation, and administration of other structures, present and future, involving the use of water in the basin. Surveys and investigations should be prosecuted actively so that data secured will be continuous and representative.

58. The National Park Service has surveyed the recreational possibilities of the potential projects and has made a number of specific recommendations which will enhance their recreational value. The Bureau of Reclamation concurs in the objectives of these proposals. The National Park Service, however, questions the advisability of the Moab power project on the ground that it "would inundate the lower slopes and bottom of an unusually scenic canyon and eliminate the existing road which runs through the canyon between Moab and Dewey, Utah." A road could be constructed along the edge of the reservoir, and in all probability this would add to the scenic attractions of the canyon. Such differences do not represent conflicts between the purposes of these agencies both of which desire to secure maximum overall benefits for the people of the basin.

59. The Fish and Wildlife Service has made preliminary studies of the potential projects reported herein and has made a number of specific recommendations which will assure the restoration and conservation of fish and wildlife resources. The Bureau of Reclamation concurs in principle with these recommendations. Owing to very limited streamflows which prevail during dry years, however, it would be impracticable to maintain the minimum releases of water which are desired. As detailed project plans are prepared, the interest of the Fish and Wildlife Service can be correlated into a unified program. In order to provide the increased fish stocking required for the new reservoirs the Fish and Wildlife Service should develop and expand its present facilities at Springville, Utah, construct a new combination trout-bass fisheries station near Page Springs in Oak Creek Canyon, about 40 miles south of Flagstaff, Ariz., and supplement the facilities of this new hatchery by further developing the Williams Station for necessary incubation of trout eggs, as recommended in its report.

60. The Grazing Service has outlined the objectives of its range-improvement program and the benefits that will result from potential projects in stabilization of the livestock industry and conservation of natural resources. Results of the proposed reclamation program in the Colorado River Basin will be favorable from a Grazing Service viewpoint.

61. The Bureau of Mines has probed the minerals of the basin to discover how they might best be mined, processed, and utilized to support the metallurgical and industrial economy that is envisioned. "The mineral industries in the Colorado River Basin constitute one of the most obvious outlets for power generated at multiple-purpose dams."

62. The Office of Indian Affairs has outlined projects that will benefit the Indians of the basin.

63. The General Land Office, which administers about 6 million acres of public land in the Colorado River Basin, has outlined a program to obtain optimum use of these public lands and to coordinate their utilization with the development of water resources.

64. The Forest Service has emphasized the need for careful management of water on the national forest lands to insure adequate safeguarding of the water yields.

65. The Federal Power Commission has furnished data upon which power utilization and market trends are based and has commented generally on the power resources of the basin.

66. The interest and cooperation of State and local groups, as well as other Federal agencies in the basin, are reflected throughout the report.

CONCLUSIONS

67. Future development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin is needed to relieve economic distress in local areas, to stabilize highly developed agricultural areas, and to create opportunities for agricultural and industrial growth and expansion throughout the Colorado River Basin. Such development should be comprehended in a basinwide plan for ultimate development of all water resources of the basin. The potential projects outlined in this report will form the basis for future detailed investigations and the selection and construction of sound projects. Considered as a group, these projects are an index of the overall results and benefits to be expected from the development and utilization of all the available waters of the Colorado River system. They indicate also the engineering feasibility and economic justification of an overall plan for basin development. Planning has progressed sufficiently to make possible a selection from among the potentialities of a group of projects to comprise a construction program for the next stage of basin development. These projects should be key features of or should fit into the final comprehensive plan to be developed through continued investigations and planning.

68. There is not enough water available in the Colorado River system for full expansion of existing and authorized projects and for all potential projects outlined in the report, including the new possibilities for exporting water to adjacent watersheds. The need for a determination of the rights of the respective States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact and its associated documents therefore is most pressing.

69. It is concluded that future development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin would benefit the national and local economies and a plan for development of all the water resources of the basin should therefore be effectuated, that the selection of a group of projects comprising the next stage of development would represent a logical step in effecting that plan, and that detailed investigations to develop the succeeding stages should be continued.

RECOMMENDATIONS

70. The following recommendations are made in view of the fact that there is not enough water available in the Colorado River system to permit construction of all the potential projects outlined in the report and for full expansion of existing and authorized projects, and that there has not been a final determination of the respective rights of the Colorado River Basin States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River:

(1) That the States of the Colorado River Basin, acting separately or jointly, recommend for construction, as the next stage of development, a group of projects, the

streamflow depletions of which will assuredly fall within ultimate allocations of Colorado River water which may be made to the individual States.

(2) That the States of the Colorado River Basin determine their respective rights to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact.

(3) That additional investigations, summarized below, and appropriations to the Department of the Interior for use by the various agencies within that Department for these investigations, be approved.

(a) The Bureau of Reclamation to continue and expand its detailed investigations of potential projects within the States of the Colorado River basin to obtain adequate information by which the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the basin States can formulate a comprehensive plan for use of all the water resources of the basin and select and recommend projects for successive stages of development.

(b) The Geological Survey, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Grazing Service, Bureau of Mines, Office of Indian Affairs, and General Land Office to initiate or continue to conduct such investigations and studies as required by the Secretary of the Interior to formulate and carry out the comprehensive plan.

E. A. MORITZ,
Regional Director, Region III.
E. O. LARSON,
Regional Director, Region IV.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have statements of many prominent people in the United States, many of whom are officials, which I desire to place in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point. They include a statement made by President Eisenhower in his message on the state of the Union, one from Vice President Nixon, one from the Secretary of the Interior, and others.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, state of the Union message, January 6, 1955:

"Now, of course, the Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, as quoted in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, October 25, 1954:

"President Eisenhower is for development of the Upper Colorado. The administration is committed to it. So am I."

Department of the Interior, report to Congress on S. 500:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: A report has been requested from this Department on S. 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

In his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower said (H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., p. 8):

" * * * the Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal

development. In keeping with this principle I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Likewise in his budget message (H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., p. M65) the President said:

"I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments."

In the budget itself it was pointed out (p. 830) that the administration proposes to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project during the next fiscal year if it is authorized and that the budget includes an item for funds to be requested for this purpose.

The substance of our views on the proper contents of a bill to implement the President's recommendation and particularly on those projects and units which should be covered in the initial legislation is contained in the draft of bill which was developed by the Bureau of the Budget in collaboration with this Department and submitted to your committee on April 1, 1954, in connection with S. 1555, 83d Congress, a predecessor of the present S. 500.

We recommend that S. 500 be examined in the light of the proposal there made and in the light of the two letters dated March 18, 1954, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to your committee and to this Department which are reprinted in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, and that, with suitable amendments, S. 500 be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Michael W. Straus, former commissioner, United States Bureau of Reclamation, as reported in the Salt Lake Telegram, August 7, 1952:

"He [Mr. Straus] described the upper Colorado Basin program as the greatest multiple purpose water conservation plan ever proposed for this continent."

Congress of Industrial Organizations:

"CIO VOICES SUPPORT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ECHO PARK DAM IN COLORADO"

"DENVER, COLO., March 22, 1955.—CIO support for the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Echo Park, Colo., as part of the upper Colorado River storage project, has been voted by the CIO committee on power, atomic energy, and resources development, it was announced today by Chairman O. A. Knight.

"Mr. Knight, who heads the CIO Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, said the decision followed an extensive meeting of the committee in Denver late last month.

"In reversing its previous stand of opposition to the dam, Mr. Knight said the committee now supports the dam project as a means of securing maximum benefits of water for irrigation and municipal purposes,

as well as the development of electric power for expansion of the upper Colorado Basin area.

"Mr. Knight's statement:

"From a careful study of the facts which have been presented to me and my committee, I am persuaded that the maximum benefit to mankind will result from the earliest possible completion of the upper Colorado storage project including Echo Park Dam. The engineering prospects provide facilities for recreation for those now interested in the scenery and wildlife aspects of this area, as well as substantial regulation of the waterflow in the river and a head of water for the production of electric power. This power is needed for the expanding population and industrial growth in the Mountain States. Salt Lake City, Utah, and Denver, Colo., and the total area between these two growing cities will greatly benefit from the earliest possible development of the total upper Colorado storage project."

Indian Rights Association:

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION,

Philadelphia, March 3, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Irrigation,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: At its regular meeting, held yesterday, the board of directors of the Indian Rights Association went on record in support of the Navaho project of the Colorado River storage project. The association urges that the Navaho project be definitely included in any legislation authorizing the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The need of the Navaho Indians for resources to enable a larger number of members of the tribe to earn a living on their reservation is fully recognized. Many thousands of Navahos should be enabled to support themselves from the use of their land to be irrigated through the Navaho project. The Navahos are entitled to first consideration in the use of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin.

We urge the inclusion of the full Navaho project in any provisions for the upper Colorado development.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE E. LINDLEY,

General Secretary.

National Farmers Union:

"STATEMENT OF ANGUS M'DONALD, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, IN SUPPORT OF THE UPPER COLORADO DEVELOPMENT"

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here to present the position of our organization in regard to S. 500 which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado storage project and participating projects. We fully endorse this legislation and feel that it is entirely consistent with the policies of the National Farmers Union adopted by delegates of the biennial convention at Denver, Colo., March 15-19, 1954. Furthermore, endorsement of upper Colorado development is entirely consistent with policies adopted by previous Farmers Union conventions—local, country, State, and National."

The Christian Science Monitor, January 27, 1955:

"The water resources of the Colorado River's upper basin must be developed. Here is an objective against which there is no open opposition of which we have knowledge.

"These resources must be developed even if it should prove necessary to build dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain, both of which lie within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Those who would argue seriously against that postulate are

also few. But as to whether it is necessary to invade a long-established national preserve is a question being hotly disputed."

Ralph A. Tudor, former Undersecretary of the Interior, as quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, November 27, 1954:

"In connection with the proposed billion-dollar program for development of the upper Colorado River basin, the Bureau of Reclamation had made plans for a dam at Echo Park within the Dinosaur National Monument, a spectacularly beautiful area in eastern Utah. Conservationists and lovers of natural beauty were up in arms over this proposal—not to mention archaeologists who had the misapprehension that the waters impounded by the dam might cover lands containing the bones of dinosaurs which once roamed this territory. Actually the bone quarry is miles from the proposed reservoir.

"Secretary McKay dispatched me to the scene. For days, I flew over the area, looking at alternate dam sites. Then I spent 3 days in Echo Park itself, climbing around the mountains. It is a delightful spot, a beautiful natural resource and, other things being equal, I certainly would say that no dam should be built in there. But other things are not equal. This is a section of the country in which water is very precious. And I had to conclude that a dam built elsewhere that would be otherwise effective would lose enough water by evaporation every year to supply a city the size of Denver. And in this semiarid country, where the whole economic development is limited by water, and where scenery is abundant, the choice was pretty clear but nonetheless hard.

"I therefore recommended to the Secretary, and to Congress, that the dam in Echo Park be built, even though it would alter—I do not concede that it would destroy—a great natural beauty spot. It was a case of balancing one natural resource against another and of using my best judgment as to which decision would serve the greater public good. I do not imagine, however, that my popularity is any too high among nature lovers. Yet had I decided against the Echo Park Dam, I would have been just as big a villain in the eyes of the upper Colorado Basin water users."

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.—Charles J. Fain, legislative assistant, NRECA, in a statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, March 2, 1955:

"In summary, I would like to say that the rural-electric systems nationally, and especially those in the power-marketing area to be served by the proposed upper Colorado storage project, wholeheartedly support and urge its authorization provided the power is marketed in accordance with traditional principles of reclamation law, and provided that authorization for an electric transmission network capable of fully integrating the individual units of the project with each other, and the project as a whole with the existing transmission network of the Bureau of Reclamation, and capable of delivering power to the load centers of preference customers, is included."

Individuals and organizations

The following individuals and organizations also are included among the millions of Americans who have expressed approval, either individually or through their organizations, of the Echo Park and Glen Canyon units or of the entire Colorado River storage project:

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.
Former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

The entire congressional delegations of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.
Bureau of the Budget.
Federal Power Commission.
United States Corps of Engineers.

Val Peterson, Administrator, Civil Defense Administration.

CONSERVATIONISTS AND CONSERVATION GROUPS

Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners.

Seth Gordon, one of the foremost conservation experts in United States.

Herbert F. Smart, former president of the Utah Wildlife Federation, finance commissioner of the State, of Utah and member of land policy committee of National Wildlife Federation.

Thomas L. Kimball, director of Colorado Game and Fish Department.

Lester Bagley, game and fish director of the State of Wyoming.

J. Parry Egan, director of Utah's Fish and Game Department.

Leo Young, editor, Wild Life Notes (West Virginia).

Roy Despain, veteran professional Colorado River runner.

Harry Aleson, Colorado River boatman.

G. E. Untermann, ranger-naturalist at Dinosaur National Monument for many years, and at present, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History at Vernal, Utah.

Finis Mitchell, explorer and photographer.

George Harris, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

William E. Scheele, naturalist, Cleveland, Ohio.

J. Leroy Kay, Pittsburgh, curator, Carnegie Museum.

Loveland, Colo., Wildlife Association.

Hugh B. Woodward, Albuquerque, N. Mex., western director, National Wildlife Federation.

LETTERS

Letters to United States Department of Interior, tabulated April 21, 1954: 2,625 for Echo Park Dam, 2,602 against the dam (Salt Lake Tribune, April 22, 1954).

INDIAN GROUPS

Indian Rights Association.

Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc.

New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs. Sam Akhea, chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

Jack Clime, Indian trader, Fruitland, N. Mex.

PRIVATE UTILITIES

Arizona Public Service Co.

Public Service Co. of Colorado.

Public Service Co. of New Mexico.

Southern Colorado Power Co.

Southern Utah Power Co.

Southern Wyoming Utilities Co.

Telluride Power Co.

Western Colorado Power Co.

Utah Power & Light Co.

Utah Power & Light Co.

MISCELLANEOUS

LaPlata Electric Association, Inc.

Montezuma County, Colorado Planning Association.

Colorado River Water Conservation District.

Farmington, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce.

Yampa Valley, Colorado Development Association, Inc.

The Water Development Association of Southeastern Colorado.

Gooseberry Project Water Users, Mt. Pleasant, Utah.

Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.

Utah Basin Water Users, Vernal, Utah.

Federated Women's Clubs, Provo, Utah.

Utah Canning Crops Association, Logan, Utah.

Emery County Project Water Users, Orangeville, Utah.

Orem Chamber of Commerce, Orem, Utah.

Utah County Civil Defense, Provo, Utah.

Pacific States Cast Iron Pipe Co., Provo, Utah.

Sterling Price—National Wild Life Association, Provo, Utah.

Ashley Farmers Union Cooperative, Vernal, Utah.

W. R. Wallace, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Henry Roberts, chairman, Central Utah Projects Committee.

Provo Electric Power Co., Provo, Utah.

J. A. Howell, Ogden, Utah.

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Sevier County Groups, Richfield, Utah.

County commissioners of Salt Lake, Sanpete, Utah, Sevier, Garfield, Tooele, Carbon, Washington, Uintah, Duchesne, Juab, Iron, Kane, Emery, Millard, Wayne, Grand, Wasatch, and San Juan, Utah.

Utah Association of County Officials.

State and county water users associations in Wayne County, Iron County, Garfield County, Beaver County, Sanpete County, Uintah County, Wasatch County, Piute County, Salt Lake County, and Juab County, Utah.

Utah Water Users Association.

Colorado River Development Association (21 counties).

Springville Irrigation District and Springville Drainage District.

Weber County Water Users Association.

District No. 2—Utah Water Users Association.

Cache County Water Users Association.

Pleasant Grove Irrigation Co.

Utah County Water Users Association.

Salt Lake County Water Users Association.

Uintah County Water Users Association.

Washington County Democratic Central Committee.

Washington County Republican Central Committee.

Kane County Republican Central Committee.

Uintah County Republican Central Committee.

Utah County Republican Central Committee.

Garfield County Republican Central Committee.

Committee for Young Men in Government (Grant S. Thorn, Springville, Utah).

Utah Mining Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Associated General Contractors, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Greater Utah Valley, Provo, Utah.

Park City Consolidated Mines, Park City, Utah.

Springville Banking Co., Springville, Utah.

Cities and towns (Utah): Payson, Springville, Orem, Nephi, Vernal, Roosevelt, Duchesne, Price, Milford, Meadow, Eureka, Scipio, Ephraim, Salt Lake City, Grantsville, Murray, Richfield, Fillmore, Fairview, Salina, Marysville, Mount Pleasant, Pleasant Grove, Provo.

Utah Municipal League.

Chambers of commerce: Salt Lake City, Richfield, Roosevelt, Wasatch, Vernal, South Salt Lake, Price, Cedar City, North Sevier, Nephi, Springville, and Ogden.

Junior chambers of commerce: Vernal, Utah State, Nephi, Delta, Gunnison Valley, Pleasant Grove, and Provo.

EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

Central Utah Vocational School.

Associated Students, Brigham Young University.

Students of the Uintah High School.

Associated Students, Utah State Agricultural College.

WOMEN'S CLUBS

Utah Federation of Women's Clubs (member).

Federated Women's Clubs of Nephi.

Women's Safety Council (Salt Lake County).

East Millard Fine Arts Guild.

Murray Women's Club.

Panguitch Women's Club.

Progressive Arts Club.

Price Federated Women's Clubs.

Richfield Study Club.

Richfield Culture Club.

Athenian Club of Lehi.

Utah Federation of Women's Clubs (Sanpete-Sevier).

Utah Federated Women's Club (State).

Roosevelt Culture Club.

Current Topic Club of Vernal.

Utah Basin District, Federated Women's Clubs.

Mothers Study Club, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

Executive committee, Utah Federated Women's Clubs.

Junior Ladies Literary Club, American Fork, Utah.

Federated Clubs of Utah (Alpha Beta Club).

Ogden District Federation of Women's Clubs.

Provo Council PTA.

Timpanogos First District Federated Women's Clubs.

CIVIC CLUBS

Kiwanis Club of Nephi.

Kiwanis Club of Provo.

Kiwanis Club of Roosevelt.

Lions Club of Beaver.

Lions Club of Union.

Lions Club of Marysville.

Lions Club of Park City.

Lions Club of Fairview.

Lions Club of Vernal.

Lions Club of Grantsville.

Lions Club of Panguitch.

Lions Club of Milford.

Lions Club of Salina.

Lions Club of Roosevelt.

Lions Club of Bingham Canyon.

Lions Club of Wayne County.

Lions Club of Moab.

Lions Club of Duchesne.

Lions Club of Mount Pleasant.

Lions Club of Pleasant Grove.

Associated Civic Clubs of Southern and Eastern Utah.

Kiwanis Club of Eureka.

Associated Civic Clubs of Northern Utah.

Cadmus Club of Pleasant Grove.

American Legion, Springville, Utah.

Central Utah Association of Engineers, Provo, Utah.

Utah Wildlife Federation.

Vernal Rod and Gun Club.

Mount Nebo Wildlife Association.

Utah Cattle & Horse Growers' Association.

Utah Basin Soil Conservation District.

Utah County Central Labor Council, Provo, Utah.

Provo Real Estate Board, Provo, Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. This is only a partial list of supporters which have come to my personal attention. It does begin to be a complete list of groups and prominent individuals in favor of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Utah Wildlife Federation; an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1955; a copy of a letter I have written to Representatives and Senators who have changed their position of hostility to that of open support; and an editorial from the Denver Post of April 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 1955.

DEAR FRIEND OF CONSERVATION: You will, I am sure, be interested in the following analysis of wildlife resources in the area to

be affected by Echo Park Dam. The analysis is by Thomas Kimball, director, game and fish department, State of Colorado. Mr. Kimball, was formerly director of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, and is particularly qualified because of his studies and investigations of resources management at Lake Mead:

"FISH AND GAME ASPECTS—ECHO PARK RESERVOIR

"(By Thomas L. Kimball, director, game and fish department, State of Colorado)

"The Echo Park Dam is planned as a concrete arch type structure 525 feet in height above the river bed elevation of approximately 5,050 feet mean sea level. The maximum water surface elevation is 5,570 feet. The water surface area at this elevation will be approximately 43,000 acres. The reservoir will be of the narrow canyon-type and, when full, will back water 63 miles up the Green River and 44 miles up the Yampa River.

"The permanent outlet elevation (penstock height) is at elevation 5,325. This elevation represents the maximum drawn-down point of the reservoir and will leave a permanent water depth of 275 feet at the dam.

"The outlet works consist of an intake tower of the type constructed at Hoover Dam supplying the power penstock. The maximum discharge capacity will be 20,000 second feet.

"In 1951 the Fish Research Division of the Colorado Game and Fish Department stationed two men in this area to gather physical data and make fish population inventories on the lower Yampa River and its tributaries. The findings showed the lower limits of trout and whitefish habitat to be in the vicinity of Craig, Colo. Siltation and high water temperatures evidently preclude the presence of cold water species in the lower sections of the Yampa River.

"The fish species which were inventoried in the portion of the Yampa to be inundated by Echo Park Reservoir are as follows: Channel catfish, Colorado River squawfish, bonytail chub, Northern Creek chub, flannelmouth sucker, bullhead catfish, roundtail chub, carp, Colorado speckled dace, and northern bluehead mountain sucker.

"This list is undoubtedly incomplete, but represents the major species now inhabiting this water. The same species are present in the Green River portion of the reservoir area although no collections were made in the Green River.

"It will be noted that the only game fish of consequence abiding there at present is the channel catfish. The Colorado River squawfish is occasionally sought by anglers for its large size.

"The fishing pressure in this area as it is now is quite low, possibly no more than 200 fisherman days per year for the entire reservoir area.

"Using United States Fish and Wildlife Service River Basin Manual evaluations, this usage amounts to a preproject monetary fishing evaluation of approximately \$1,500 per year.

"A series of water and air temperatures were taken daily at various points along the lower Yampa River in 1951. The significant temperature stations with relation to Echo Park Reservoir were at Lily Park and Pat's Hole. The highest air temperature recorded was 91° F. and the highest water temperature was 79° F. These occurred in the last week in July 1951. Water temperature stayed below 60° F. until early in July.

"Water temperatures above 70° F. lasted from mid-July to the second week in August at which time they slowly began to cool to 65° in early September.

"This temperature data points up the fact that it would not take an excessive drop in temperature to make these waters within temperature tolerance ranges of cold water game fish species such as trout and whitefish.

"It is felt that the construction of Echo Park Reservoir would drop water temperatures at least in the lower and central strata to well within trout temperature tolerances.

"In all probability other game fish with greater temperature tolerance ranges such as walleyed pike and largemouth black bass would create a significant fishery in the upper strata of the lake.

"Utilization of a fishery in this area would not be as great when compared to reservoirs near larger centers of population; however, the eventual quality and quantity of the fishery would play a large part in its popularity and usage.

"Using the very minimum figure of one pound of fish to the creel per surface acre per year on the basis of a partially drawn-down reservoir of 20,000 acres (43,000 acres full) the reservoir would yield an annual monetary evaluation of \$81,600 for a trout fishery or \$54,400 for a bass and walleye fishery (River Basin Manual evaluation figures).

"This evaluation is considered for the reservoir fishery only. The stream fishery below the dam would develop into an excellent trout fishery if the water is drawn from underneath the surface of the lake as is planned in the schedule of operations. The Colorado River below Hoover Dam is a case in point here.

"There is no attempt made to evaluate the stream fishery as only a short portion is in Colorado; however, it should be a valuable adjunct to the State of Utah.

"This water suitability for trout should extend downstream as far as Jensen, Utah, due to the canyon terrain and absence of silt-carrying tributaries.

"There can be no other conclusion drawn than the fact that the construction of Echo Park Dam would provide significant enhancement to the region from the fisheries standpoint.

"The following is a summary by species as to the effect the construction of the Echo Park and Flaming Gorge Dams will have on wildlife. This portion of the report has been made by Gilbert N. Hunter, game manager for the Colorado Game and Fish Department.

"1. Deer: Generally, from studying the water levels, as well as the vegetative type, and deer populations within this area, I do not feel there will be a great amount of loss in the available deer range, because in the upper Green, namely around Smith Ferry, the depth of the water is not great, and the bottom lands that will be covered in this particular area have been severely overgrazed by domestic stock. The same condition applies in Little Brown's Park and Big Brown's Park. Furthermore, in these areas observations would indicate that the deer are inclined to hold more to the slopes rather than the bottoms. The general type is pinion juniper and sage, and outside of sage there is a very small amount of palatable browse. In the main canyons, that is from Ladore on the Green River, down to Echo Park Dam site, and the Yampa from Cross Mountain to Pat's Hole, the canyons are very steep and narrow, and inaccessible to large numbers of deer. The big wintering concentration on the Yampa will not be materially affected, due to the fact that deer generally winter well above the proposed high-water line.

"2. Mountain sheep: The area in Ladore Canyon is the only location where at present mountain sheep exist. Naturally they are on the slopes far above the water level and will not be affected. This is the area where a transplant should be made, and has been recommended.

"3. Migratory birds: The Green and Yampa Rivers have a very good population of the greater Canadian geese. At the present time the heavy nesting areas are confined in Big Brown's Park, and along the little shelves

immediately adjacent to both the Yampa and the Green Rivers. Ducks are generally common throughout the area. It was observed that in the Yampa Canyon from Lilly Park down, the concentration of geese was not as heavy as that of the Green. This can be attributed to the fact that again the canyon walls rise abruptly from the water, and there is little or no area suitable for nesting. It is felt that by flooding the Brown's Park area that other swampy areas will be created, which should, unless the water level varies too much at the time of the nesting period, greatly increase the number of geese and ducks within this area.

"4. Beaver: In the upper portions of the Green River, that is above Ladore Canyon, beaver are quite common. They are bank beaver, and a great deal of their habitat will be destroyed; however, on the other hand, it may be that they will adapt themselves to the situation by moving to higher elevation, which in all probability will in time be reseeded by willows. If the water level does not vary too much this should not cause any great loss as pertaining to the beaver. (End of Kimball's statement.)

"Because of the great benefits to our western wildlife resources, the Directors of the Game, Fish, and Conservation Departments of the 11 Western States, at their annual meeting in May, 1954, endorsed and approved the construction of Echo Park Dam. Why shouldn't all conservationists?"

Yours for better fishing and hunting,
D. KEITH BARNES,
President, Utah Wildlife Federation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of
April 11, 1955]

COLORADO BASIN WATER DISPUTE SWIRLS IN WEST

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—People of the States where the Colorado River originates regard the big dams and powerplants proposed in the Upper Colorado Basin Storage Project Act, favored by the Eisenhower administration and recently approved 11 to 1 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as absolutely vital to their continued growth and prosperity.

Therefore, they grow more bitter over California's strong and continued opposition to the authorizing legislation. They feel the project will only carry out, a third of a century later, the longtime arrangements made by the seven Colorado Basin States under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Much of the river's flow still runs unused into the Gulf of California, an intolerable waste in an arid land. Upper basin residents and officials feel that the project development, providing storage for this wasted water, would insure southern California's future water supply as well as their own.

POLITICAL TONES

They say California got more than half of all the money authorized by the 83d Congress for all reclamation projects in all 17 Western States, and that California now has pending before the Congress, requests for projects totaling hundreds of millions of dollars more.

Their attitude, right or wrong, was well put by United States Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate committee, when he declared that if California succeeds in defeating the upper basin project, "no new projects will be approved for California as long as I am chairman."

The water war might also have a bearing on national politics, particularly if Mr. Eisenhower should retire and a Californian aspire in 1956 to the presidency on the Republican ticket.

One angle that politicians notice, whether the public does or not, is that while giant California has 30 House Members against only 12 for all the other Colorado Basin

States put together, the upper basin States—those which consider themselves peculiarly aggrieved by the California stand—have 10 United States Senators to California's 2. Nevada has traditionally been neutral.

Regardless of party, those 10 Senators are, by the pressure of back-home opinion, welded into a solid bloc in this matter. It would be political oblivion for any of the 10 to vote with California.

Two key dams

In what was regarded as a trial run for the fate of the big project in the 83d Congress, the House last year defeated by a very small margin the bill to authorize Colorado's proposed Fryingpan project which would divert about 80,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water over the mountains. The California delegation voted 23 to 7 against it. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN (Republican), of Massachusetts, then Speaker of the House, therefore decided not even to bring up the upper basin project act.

Crux of the dispute over the project centers about the two enormous key dams planned. The Glen Canyon Dam on the Arizona-Utah border would cost about \$450 million, would store about 26 million acre-feet of water, and would provide a huge power supply.

The Echo Park Dam on the Colorado-Utah border, within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, would cost about \$175 million, would store about 6 million acre-feet, and would provide a power supply second only to Glen Canyon.

Californians are less opposed to Glen Canyon, for the reason that there is no place for either its water or power benefits to go, save downriver to them.

The big fight has been on the Echo Park Dam, as an allegedly precedent-setting invasion of a national monument. Conservation and wildlife societies all over the Nation have lined up to oppose this dam. Proponents say that it is so efficient, both for water storage and power, that no other suggested site will do.

In a recent speech in the Senate documented with maps and citations of Government records, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, sought to demolish the invasion contention, and in the eyes of upper basin people, at least, did very well.

He pointed out not only that President Roosevelt's original proclamation of 1938 enlarging the monument to its present proportions reserved a power site in the area, but that 11 successive reservations of power sites had been made in the canyons between 1904 and 1925. He said that all of them retain precedence over the dedication of the area for monument purposes, and that none have ever been withdrawn.

He cited correspondence dating back to 1934, when the National Park Service was working to establish the monument, in which the Park Service asked the Federal Power Commission to cancel its power reservations in favor of the monument, and was refused. The power commission could not do anything else under the law, he said.

Letter cited

He further cited a recent letter from Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, that in the opinion of the Commission these power reservations are still valid.

In other words, said Mr. WATKINS, the monument is the interloper, and the victory of those who would leave it untouched would establish a precedent that valid and prior Government commitments can illegally be set aside at will.

He added that the advocates of the monument were perfectly willing in 1938 to have it established subject to the prior power-site withdrawals, once they had failed to get those canceled.

Reports of the Park Service show that in 1954 about 2,000 persons visited the disputed canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers by road, and about 900 made the perilous downriver run (which requires guides) by boat.

Senator WATKINS has also pointed out that the Bureau of Reclamation plan includes an elaborate recreational development with access roads permitting many thousand Americans to see the big dam and the canyons, in place of the less than 3,000 who were able to visit the canyons in 1954.

UNITED STATES SENATE,

April 14, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It may have escaped your attention, but the sportsmen in your State affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation recently reconsidered their previous opposition to Echo Park Dam and voted against a 1955 resolution of the National organization, which opposes this unit, of the proposed Colorado River storage project.

This was disclosed by Charles S. Caillison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in an appearance before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee on March 28. The federation's resolution, opposed by 11 States which had favored a similar resolution in 1954, actually was approved by only 30 States represented at the organization's annual convention in Montreal, Canada, March 11 to 13. It is my conviction that many of these remaining States also would change their position if they had access to all the facts.

I felt obligated to bring this matter before you, because the House hearing record has not yet been printed, and because I feel assured that the propagandists of the National Wildlife Federation will not direct your attention to such a reversal of position by so many of their State affiliates.

Wildlife groups in these 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming—now have joined the national Congress of Industrial Organizations in taking a public stand in favor of Echo Park Dam, after examining all the facts. The Utah Wildlife Federation has always supported Echo Park Dam.

Some of the facts on Echo Dam are set forth in the enclosed reprint of my recent floor speech on this subject.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

[From the Denver Post of April 14, 1955]

THE WHOLE TRUTH ON ECHO PARK DAM

On March 28, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, demolished the objection to the Echo Park Dam on grounds that it would invade the Dinosaur Monument and thereby establish precedent that would threaten the National Park System.

WATKINS introduced records and correspondence which—

1. Established incontrovertibly that the Echo Park site was only one of several sites in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that had been withdrawn for power purposes by the Federal Power Commission several years before the monument was expanded in 1938.

2. Proved that the Department of the Interior, including both Secretary Ickes and the National Park Service, were aware not only of the withdrawals, but of their lawful effect upon the nature and administration of the Dinosaur Monument before it was expanded by presidential proclamation.

3. Revealed that the Department of the Interior had been advised in 1939, through an opinion of its own solicitor, Nathan R. Margold, that a monument could be created "subject to the reclamation withdrawals and

power site classifications and thereby preserve and continue the effectiveness of the withdrawals and classifications."

4. Affirmed that the "reservation" in President Roosevelt's monument proclamation was not (in Roosevelt's own words) to "affect the operation of the Federal waterpower act of June 10, 1920 * * *." That is precisely the act under which the Echo Park and other sites were withdrawn by the FPC and described in 1934 by Chairman McNinch as * * * "one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

5. Supported his (WATKINS') contention that if "invasion" is taking place, the aggressors are those who are trying to set aside lawful power withdrawals and override the Federal Waterpower Act to superimpose a national monument on an area that had been staked out for other purposes many years before 1938.

Before Roosevelt expanded the monument from its original 80 acres (1915) to 203,885 acres, the matter of "vacating" the power withdrawals was taken up with the FPC twice. The issue was raised first in 1934 by A. E. Demaray, acting director of the National Park Service. It was brought to the attention of the FPC again in 1935 by Secretary Ickes, who asked about the "possibility of releasing the power withdrawals" * * * thus to place the "proposed monument * * * in a much better position from the standpoint of administration."

The power withdrawals were never vacated. The conservation groups opposed to the Echo Park Dam have not, to our knowledge, claimed that they were.

Apparently those opposing this dam are asking us to believe that the President himself, in his proclamation creating the monument, personally vacated the power withdrawals by failing to include them, specifically, in the exemptions of his statement. But if that were so, why did Roosevelt specifically refer to "affect operation of the Waterpower Act of 1920," under which the withdrawals were made and sustained by the decision of the FPC in 1934 and 1935?

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project are not invading this national monument. The conservationists, in an emotional and unreasoning mood, are trying, in effect, to rewrite both the record and the law by misleading the friends and champions of our natural playgrounds.

Listen to this: "Construction of Echo Park Dam * * * would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our national recreational reserves. Once the inviolability of the park system is breached in Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Echo Park Dam is the beachhead from which a coordinated onslaught could be made by private interests against the boundaries of national parks."

What about the "inviolability" of the Water Power Act or, for that matter, of the President's proclamation which cited it? Since when has a program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proceeding upon the clear authority of public law, become an onslaught similar to that of private enterprise imperiling the National Park System?

Senator WATKINS' thorough, documented chronology of events up to and immediately following the act expanding the Dinosaur Monument exposes the error, presumably innocent, of those who believe the dam would set a fatal precedent.

If the power priorities on the Yampa and the Green may be thus arbitrarily ignored or set aside, then the Water Power Act of 1920 is without meaning, and the purposes and authority of the Federal Power Commission are canceled by implication. That we doubt will be accepted by Congress or was intended by Roosevelt in 1938. And it is a public disservice for the conservationists—

with whom we have pleurably joined in many worthy programs for the defense of natural values in this country—to proceed further down the wrong path they have taken.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the limitation on debate which I understand we shall have tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks which I had prepared on certain aspects of the bill which is before the Senate printed as a statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the index to a book on the national parks: What They Mean to You and Me, by Freeman Tilden, there is an entry that reads as follows: "Hetch-Hetchy, classic example of needless spoliation of park scenery, page 173." On page 173 Mr. Tilden says, "I recall the outburst of infatuation that led to the creation of a stupid Hetch-Hetchy reservoir in what was once a treasured part of the wild beauty of Yosemite."

I should like to review with you this "classic example of needless spoliation of park scenery." Like millions of other Americans I am opposed to the Echo Park Dam, because it is proposed for construction within our national park system. And I am amazed, and also deeply shocked, to realize how closely we here seem to be repeating history.

I am shocked because the history that we are in danger of repeating is hardly creditable to us. It is history that rather should teach us a lesson of never-again.

It is history that shows that those who were defending a national park against a dam proposal a half century ago were right. Their opponents won out, but nevertheless they were wrong. We lost a marvelously beautiful valley in one of our greatest national parks.

Where once there was the beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park, there is now the stark drab reservoir of the O'Shaunnessy Dam. In a display of photographs entitled "Hetch Hetchy: Before and After" in The Living Wilderness magazine for winter 1953-54 (p. 36), there is a photograph of the tragic scene that confronts the few visitors who now seek out this valley, a photograph that I wish could be enlarged and seen clearly by all of us who share the responsibility for protecting the national park system. This photograph shows this reservoir, with the characteristic scar along its edge that comes with the "drawdown"—the great lowering of water levels that promoters of dams for playgrounds always neglect to describe in their visions of the future for which they strive. In the foreground of this scene is a stone wall. In the far background is a beautiful waterfall. But in the foreground is a stone wall and a bare gravel road. Standing ominously in this deserted scene is a large road sign: "One way, do not enter."

Once already we have proved that this is a way which we in America do not enter without a drastic disregard of the signs by which we are seeking to govern our national welfare.

And once is too often, as Robert K. Cutter puts it in an impressive article published by the Sierra Club. In this pamphlet, Hetch Hetchy—Once Is Too Often, the tragic case of the once-beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley is strikingly presented. I am sure other Senators also have received copies of this booklet. The photographs of the noble valley of Hetch Hetchy before "alteration," with all of its loveliness, inspire reverence and awe. It is plain that were the valley still in existence

today, there would be thousands of Americans enjoying it in the same way that they are enjoying Yosemite Valley. Hetch Hetchy's trees, its mountains, its tumbling streams, its majestic waterfalls were like a benediction. They would have provided for ages to come rest and relaxation for the mind and spirit of countless Americans.

But Hetch Hetchy had a good dam site; and all that might have been lost because Senators in 1913 believed the statements that a dam would not destroy the valley, but would instead enhance its beauty and create a great and attractive natural object.

Did these predictions come true? No. You have only to look, a little further on, at the picture of Hetch Hetchy today to see how wrong were the prophets of 1913. Or, Mr. President, open once the folder called What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur? and see, above the beautiful scenes of Hetch Hetchy half a century ago and then see the picture, below, of the reservoir today. That picture points to the fallaciousness of the reasoning that Echo Park will be improved by a dam. The photograph of Hetch Hetchy today shows a bleak expanse of dead water, made particularly ugly by the fluctuating water levels which expose stumps of dead trees and the muddy, rock-strewn shores.

Before Hetch Hetchy was inundated there might perhaps have seemed to be some possibilities in the reasoning that a dam would not destroy the beauty and wonders of Dinosaur National Monument. We did not then have concrete evidence that "alteration" really means ruin for such an area; that inundation of a natural area such as Hetch Hetchy and Dinosaur means its destruction.

What of the prediction that crowds of people would flock to the altered Hetch Hetchy? We have only to ask, who hears of Hetch Hetchy today or who knows of it, except those who knew it once and who mourn its destruction, or those who see it and hear of it as a sad example. The crowds stay away in droves. For every million people who delight in the beauty, the natural beauty of Yosemite and spend vacations there, there are a thousand who drive up to Hetch Hetchy, turn around, and leave. The prediction that Hetch Hetchy Reservoir would become a playground for millions has evaporated under the bright sun of reality.

Today, we are being told that Echo Park, when flooded, will become the playground for millions, and we are seeing the wide distribution of a brochure with artistic conceptions of Echo Park as such a playground. Thus history threatens to repeat itself—a threat that is indeed frightening.

In the Hetch Hetchy case, too, there was wide distribution of similarly pretty conceptions of the inundated Hetch Hetchy valley as seen by an artist who was hired to make the drawings. One such drawing was distributed to the desk of every Member of the United States Senate the day of the final vote on the bill that, like this one we face, was supposed to create this beautiful lake. The drawing conjured up beauties which are not there. When we look at Hetch Hetchy today we know the answer to the question that was printed at the head of the drawing distributed to the Members of the Senate in 1913 when Hetch Hetchy was at stake. The question read: "Does this beautiful lake ruin this beautiful valley?" The answer as we look at Hetch Hetchy today is a resounding "Yes." It has ruined it. And it is not beautiful after all.

The irony of the story of Hetch Hetchy is that history has proved that it was not necessary to ruin the valley in order for San Francisco to get the water that it needed. There were alternatives which were ignored, which would have provided San Francisco with its water and at the same time would have kept for the Nation an incomparable recreation area of which it could be mighty proud.

There are alternatives to the Echo Park Dam, just as there were for Hetch Hetchy. We need not be the destroyers of our park heritage in order to provide the upper Colorado Basin States with the water and power they require. We can have both, if we make the necessary effort. I strongly urge that we do so. For once destroyed, the scenic splendor of the Dinosaur National Monument cannot be recreated.

So, let us look with some care at this once-is-too-often bit of history that is now threatening to repeat itself.

What was Hetch Hetchy?

In the final chapter of his great, now classic work on The Mountains of California, John Muir called Hetch Hetchy "a wonderfully exact counterpart" of Yosemite—the Yosemite that in the summer time now is crowded with thousands and thousands of visitors—in 1954. Yosemite, that great U-shaped valley with its magnificent cliff walls rising in grandeur and enlivened with waterfalls. The resemblance to Yosemite that John Muir noted in the Hetch Hetchy Valley, he found, as he said, "not only in its sublime rocks and waterfalls but in the gardens, groves, and meadows of its flower-park-like floor." Describing the valley's beauty and particularly a great waterfall that excelled even Yosemite's Bridal Veil falls "both in height and airy-fairy beauty and behavior," John Muir wrote as follows:

"Imagine yourself in Hetch Hetchy on a sunny day in June, standing waist-deep in grass and flowers, while the great pines sway dreamily with scarcely perceptible motion. Looking northward across the valley you see a plain, gray granite cliff rising abruptly out of the gardens and groves to a height of 1,800 feet, and in front of it the waterfall called Tueeulala's silvery scarf burning with irised sun-fire. In the first white outburst at the head there is abundance of visible energy, but it is speedily hushed and concealed in divine repose, and its tranquil progress to the base of the cliff is like that of a downy feather in a still room. Now observe the fineness and marvelous distinctness of the various sun-illuminated fabrics into which the water is woven; they sift and float from form to form down the face of that grand gray rock in so leisurely and unconfused a manner that you can examine their texture, and patterns and tones of color as you would a piece of embroidery held in hand. Toward the top of the fall you see groups of booming, comet-like masses, their solid white heads separate, their tails like combed silk interlacing among delicate gray and purple shadows, ever forming and dissolving, worn out by friction in their rush through the air."

I am trying to suggest the value of this Hetch Hetchy Valley as part of a national park, to suggest how through the eyes of a great naturalist and explorer we all still can have some understanding of its splendor.

John Muir went on to describe the other magnificent waterfalls of Hetch Hetchy and the many smaller streams that come over the walls which he described as leaping from ledge to ledge with birdlike song and watering many a hidden cliff garden and fernery.

"The correspondence between the Hetch Hetchy walls in their trends, sculpture, physical structure, and general arrangement of the main rock masses and those of the Yosemite Valley," John Muir said, "has excited the wondering admiration of every observer."

With a sublimity of words appropriate to the scene of which he wrote, this great son of the wilderness called Hetch Hetchy a grand landscape garden, one of nature's rarest and most precious mountain temples and he said:

"As in Yosemite, the sublime rocks of its walls seem to glow with life, whether leaning back in repose or standing erect in

thoughtful attitudes, giving welcome to storms and calms alike, their brows in the sky, their feet set in the groves and gay flowery meadows, while birds, bees, and butterflies help the river and waterfalls to stir all the air into music—things frail and fleeting and types of permanence meeting here and blending, just as they do in Yosemite, to draw her lovers into close and confiding communion with her."

"Sad to say," however, John Muir had also to record that "this most precious and sublime feature of the Yosemite National Park, one of the greatest of all our natural resources for the uplifting joy and peace and health of the people" was "in danger of being dammed and made into a reservoir to help supply San Francisco with water and light, thus flooding it from wall to wall and burying its gardens and groves one or two hundred feet deep."

It is our great national misfortune that Hetch Hetchy was thus dammed and is today thus flooded. It is our perplexity today that this same misfortune is now threatened for the scenic wild canyons of the Green and the Yampa Rivers in Dinosaur National Monument.

Listen to what John Muir wrote about the threat to Hetch Hetchy. Does it not sound shockingly familiar to us who have been hearing so persistently the arguments of those who now want to dam Echo Park?

"This grossly destructive commercial scheme," wrote John Muir, "has long been planned and urged (though water as pure and abundant can be got from sources outside of the people's park, in a dozen different places), because of the comparative cheapness of the dam and of the territory which it is sought to divert from the great uses to which it was dedicated."

"The proponents of the dam scheme"—and I am quoting John Muir writing about the Hetch Hetchy Dam—"the proponents of the dam scheme bring forward a lot of bad arguments to prove that the only righteous thing to do with the people's parks is to destroy them bit by bit as they are able."

"Their arguments"—and I am still quoting John Muir—"their arguments are curiously alike those of the devil, devised for the destruction of the first garden—so much of the very best Eden fruit going to waste; so much of the best Tuolumne water and Tuolumne scenery going to waste."

I interrupt myself to point out that John Muir was the organizer and first president, and for a great many years the president, of the Sierra Club. He was not opposing the Hetch Hetchy Dam because of a hidden sympathy for California water interests. He was opposing California water interests. Today the Sierra Club suffers the inferences of insinuating opponents who suspect these devoted preservers of national parks of opposition to another dam in another national park for unworthy secondary reasons, because the supposed beneficiaries of this Echo Park Dam are in a rival State. The executive director of the Sierra Club today when he testifies before our Senate committee is subject to the duress of such inferences and of questioning that is diligently pursued with these insinuations, yet the club which he represents—and I hold it to be one of the outstanding forces for conservation in America—that club under its first great leader fought earnestly against a dam supposed to be for the benefit of the club's own headquarters city, and fought as earnestly as the Sierra Club leaders of our day now contend against the proponents of the Echo Park Dam. They do this for the same reason—because they are devoted to the preservation of our national parks unimpaired by such structures.

John Muir was not confronted with arguments about the waters of the Colorado but about those of his own California—"so much

of the best Tuolumne water," he was told, "and Tuolumne scenery going to waste."

Of his opponents John Muir said:

"Few of their statements are even partly true, and all are misleading."

This is strong language—not ours of our opponents, I hasten again to emphasize, but John Muir's comments half a century ago.

As an example of what he meant, John Muir cited his opponents claim that the national park feature that he was defending was "like thousands of others." John Muir answered: "On the contrary it is a very uncommon feature; after Yosemite, the rarest and in many ways the most important in this national park."

I call special attention to another example of the arguments that John Muir heard from the people who insisted on building the Hetch Hetchy Dam, in Yosemite National Park—the people who insisted on and succeeded in building this dam in a national park. These arguments thus are especially interesting in this case because we can now see how true they were.

John Muir's opponents said this about the Hetch Hetchy Dam, which they were determined to build, and I quote:

"Damming and submerging it 175 feet deep would enhance its beauty by forming a crystal-clear lake."

Does not this sound familiar?

To this argument a half century ago John Muir replied, and again I quote:

"Landscape gardens, places of recreation and worship, are never made beautiful by destroying and burying them. The beautiful sham lake, forsooth, would be only an eyesore, a dismal blot on the landscape, like many others to be seen in the Sierra. For instead of keeping it at the same level all year, allowing Nature centuries of time to make new shore, it would, of course be full only a month or two in the spring, when the snow is melting fast; then it would be gradually drained, exposing the slimy sides of the basin and shallower parts of the bottom, with the gathered drift and waste, death and decay of the upper basins, caught here instead of being swept on to decent natural burial along the banks of the river or in the sea. Thus the Hetch Hetchy Dam-lake," John Muir warned, "would be only a rough imitation of a natural lake for a few spring months, an open sepulchre for the others."

To see how right John Muir was, all we have to do is to go to Hetch Hetchy and see there, behind that O'Shaughnessy Dam, the reservoir that now inundates this valley. Or here today we need only see the photographs to which I referred in the magazine *The Living Wilderness*, or the photographs on the back cover of the pamphlet to which I referred called *Hetch Hetchy Once Is Too Often*. Or open once the folder called *What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur?* Thus in photographs and drawings we can see the original beauty of Hetch Hetchy, the fantasy of the would-be dam builders in their promises for recreation, and finally the actual result of the successful dam project.

Robert K. Cutter today, asking the question, "What is Hetch Hetchy now?" calls it "just another dammed artificial lake," and comments, as follows:

"Those of you who have only seen it since it was flooded will refuse to believe that it ever approached Kings River Canyon in beauty, let alone Yosemite. Hetch Hetchy now isn't worth a 35-millimeter Kodachrome film. So much for beauty."

"Now, what about it as an area for recreation?" Mr. Cutter goes on to ask, and he answers:

"Of the three canyons, Hetch Hetchy, Yosemite, and Kings Canyon, Hetch Hetchy is the nearest to the central California center of population, and there is a beautiful paved road leading right to it. If it were of

equal recreational value there would be 10 visitors to every 1 at Kings River Canyon, which is the most distant. But are there?"

"No," he answers, "it's just the opposite. Why should anyone want to go to Hetch Hetchy now?"

Mr. Cutter concludes:

"Thus, we do not have to guess or debate. Hetch Hetchy teaches us that former Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor was right in 1954 when he advised that in flooding Dinosaur's 'the alteration will be substantial,' and wrong when he advised that 'the beauty of the park will by no means be destroyed and it will remain an area of great attraction.'"

Here is how this "case in history" is summed up by our own conservationists of today who are defending again with zeal and determination the natural beauty of one of our superb dedicated areas. They write in this folder, *What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur*, as follows:

"Hetch Hetchy was not quite so beautiful as its neighbor, Yosemite Valley, but it had much of Yosemite's charm and living—great oaks, verdant meadows, tree-framed waterfalls, and one of the finest streams in all the Sierra Nevada. Here hundreds of thousands might have camped in these days of overcrowding in our parks. But Hetch Hetchy had a good dam site. True, others existed downstream—and still exist today—and the water would flow down to them for diversion to a distant, growing city. Hetch Hetchy, though, could add a little more to hydroelectric power production, for which alternative sources were then available—and more and more alternatives are becoming available."

"A great battle waged. * * * San Francisco's mayor, urging the dam, said of the valley in 1911: ' * * * its beauty will be enhanced, making the valley more sightly and accessible. * * * There can be no question but that the beauty of the scene, with a dam easily concealed by grasses and vines, will be enhanced by the effect of the lake reflecting all above it and about it and will be in itself a great and attractive natural object.'"

"The dam was built. The valley is buried forever. It is more accessible. But for every million people who come to Yosemite Valley to stay, a mere thousand come to Hetch Hetchy's fluctuating reservoir to turn around and leave."

Mr. President, Patrick Henry in his famous speech entitled "The Alternative," delivered in the Virginia convention, in 1775, and best known for its eloquent conclusion, "Give me liberty, or give me death," said to his colleagues:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past."

In the light of experience, judging the future by the past, we most certainly should insist on an alternative to this proposed Echo Park Dam that threatens again to violate an area of superb natural beauty and wonder—an area that rather than be dammed should be forever preserved in our national park system. For, indeed, there are alternatives to this Echo Park Dam, just as there were to the Hetch Hetchy Dam. And it is with regard to this possibility of an alternative that history gives us our final admonition on this page with the running head "Hetch Hetchy."

Perhaps this page of history is most briefly read from Linnie Marsh Wolfe's great biography *Son of the Wilderness: The Life of John Muir*, published in 1945 by Alfred A. Knopf, and in that year honored with the Pulitzer prize for biography. Here is how Linnie Marsh Wolfe concludes her account of John Muir's—and our—defeat in the Hetch Hetchy controversy. She writes:

"Muir felt no bitterness against the people of San Francisco over the Hetch Hetchy. He placed the blame at the door of 3 or 4 ambitious traders and politicians calling themselves the city of San Francisco.

"As the years went on, the citizens suffered for the acts of these leaders, but were obligated to make the best of a bad bargain. They had been told that the project would cost not more than \$50 million; but engineering difficulties brought the total up to the neighborhood of \$100 million.

"Long before the system was completed, the adjacent East Bay communities, worn out with waiting to share in the promised benefits had combined to develop their own project.

"In the midtwenties they chose the Mokelumne River as a source, purchased the rights, and built the system within 4 years at a cost of about \$36 million.

"Before San Francisco had finished her Herculean task, in a year of great shortage (1931), the Mokelumne River was helping to supply that city with pure mountain water at the rate of 25 million gallons per day.

"One of the ironies of the situation was that the Mokelumne source had been rejected by the San Francisco officials in favor of the Hetch Hetchy."

Thus, not only do we see in this case demonstrated the destruction of an area of a great national park but also the demonstration of the value of an alternative.

In the light of this experience, so dramatically parallel to that through which we are again passing, let us earnestly resist the temptation to exploit the Dinosaur National Monument for the supposed advantages of the proposed Echo Park Dam. Let us rather insist that an alternative be selected from the many possibilities that have so far been considered or that may yet be developed with careful sincere effort.

By all means let us have the advantages of water storage and hydroelectric power production, but let us at the same time preserve our parks.

The one hopeful outcome of the Hetch Hetchy controversy was the determination on the part of the people of this country that in the future the national park areas should be firmly protected.

When Hetch Hetchy was in jeopardy there was no recognized National Park System. There was no National Park Service.

As William Frederick Bade, John Muir's early biographer said, "the compensating good" which John Muir felt sure would arise out of the "tragic sacrifice" of Hetch Hetchy would have to be in "the consolidation of public sentiment against any possible repetition of such a raid."

That "consolidation of public sentiment," Mr. President, resulted in the establishment by Congress of a National Park Service and a National Park System, and it has today resulted in thousands of protests against this Echo Park Dam proposal.

On August 25, 1916, 3 years after the act that permitted the sacrifice of Hetch Hetchy, President Woodrow Wilson approved an act (39 Stat. 535) that set up the National Park Service, provided for the administration and protection of national parks and monuments, and defined their purpose.

This purpose, according to this act of Congress, is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Never since this declaration of national policy by Congress, never since the National Park System was thus established, never since we learned our Hetch Hetchy lesson has there ever been permitted the construction of a dam in our National Park System.

Let it not ever be said that the 84th Congress turned its back on this experience and, permitting itself to be misled, countenanced the invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument for this Echo Park Dam.

Let us rather heed the lesson of Hetch Hetchy and by reaffirming make still stronger our national determination to preserve a National Park System "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement from Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness, regarding the upper Colorado River storage project and its relation to wilderness preservation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE DAM OUR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM?

The aim of the Wilderness Society is to represent the public interest in preserving and protecting our national park system and our other areas of wilderness and park lands that have been set aside for preservation.

So long as any project includes a proposal to use an area of the national park system in a way that is inconsistent with its purpose as defined by Congress, "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations," so long would the recommendation of the Wilderness Society be against its approval. Yet I do not wish to be considered an opponent of the upper Colorado River storage project, except as it does threaten areas dedicated for preservation. It is rather my purpose to urge that any bill approved by Congress be one from which all such threats have been carefully excluded and in which provision is made for the protection of national parks and monuments. It is my belief that such a bill can be prepared that will adequately meet the needs for a sound upper Colorado River storage project, and after 5 years of deep concern with the problems now being discussed, I can assure you that I should welcome such a bill with great eagerness.

Summer before last, on a trip through Colorado and Utah, my wife and I, with our then 15- and 7-year-old sons and our 12- and 10-year-old daughters, camped at the mouth of Split Mountain Canyon, in the Dinosaur National Monument, motored and hiked out to Harper's Corner, and then returned and motored on down into Echo Park.

A beautiful park it is, too, so named by Maj. John Wesley Powell, who camped there on his now historic expedition in 1869, and described Echo Park itself as "the size of a good farm."

There, along the Green River, in that lovely grassy park, with its beautiful cottonwood trees, across from Steamboat Rock, my wife cooked hamburgers and made a meal for us, while the children climbed on the rock slopes of the canyon wall and I wandered about, exhilarated, and overawed—and perplexed, as I tried to understand the dam-building proposal that has focused so much controversial attention on this area of our national park system.

Then, as I stood there along the Green River, a ways away from the others, I shouted across the river:

"Should we build a dam here?"

The echo came back with my question still in it:

"Dam here?"

That question is still echoing, in the corridors of the Department of the Interior, in the White House, in the Halls of Congress, and indeed throughout the country.

That is the question that we face here today in our concern for the preservation of our national park system. It is one of the great questions that face us all in our efforts to cherish and use wisely the natural resources on which our own, our children's, and our children's children's welfare depends.

Again and again we conservationists who have been compelled to oppose so earnestly the proposed Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams have insisted and have sought to emphasize that we do not object to dams, or to reclamation, or to water storage or hydroelectric power production, but to the proposal to use a particular site, or sites, in the Dinosaur National Monument for the Echo Park and/or the Split Mountain Dams.

This Echo Park question that conservationists all over the United States are asking, and answering so earnestly, is a question that challenges the very principle on which our national park protection policy is based. That is the principle that once an area has been set aside for preservation it should be held inviolate and used for commodity purposes only in the case of extreme national need.

Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug once stated this principle, in its application to dams, as follows:

"Large power and flood-control projects should not be recommended for construction in national parks, unless the need for such projects is so pressing that the economic stability of our country, or its existence, would be endangered without them."

It is with this principle of the integrity of the National Park System that we conservationists are most deeply concerned as we face this Echo Park question. The proponents of the Echo Park (and Split Mountain) Dam construction seem also to be deeply conscious that the controversy is in large measure over this principle, for it is hard indeed to escape the conclusion that the persistent advocacy of the Echo Park Dam is intended to modify this principle, reverse the national policy for park preservation, and secure for those who are responsible for impoundment projects the freedom to use any National Park System site that seems advantageous.

It is not the building of a dam or dams that is at issue but rather the choice of a site or sites. The Echo Park question is not whether to build a dam but "Shall we build a dam here?"

And my deep conviction, my most earnest persuasion is that this is indeed no place for a dam.

This is one of the great places of the world, a place of so great natural grandeur that it should most assuredly be protected with great respect.

I wish I could somehow express here something of its grandeur and wonder.

If we could raise the venetian blinds at those windows over there, Mr. Chairman, and look across the mall of this beautiful Capital City we would have in view the Washington Monument and in its nobleness we might find a measure of a sort of the magnificence with which we are here concerned—the magnificence of the natural features which we cherish in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Think of standing at the base of the Washington Monument and looking up at its grandeur. Imagine again the respect and admiration, the aspiration and noble inspiration which we feel as we place ourselves before its 555-foot thrust into the sky.

Think then again of a solid natural rock a hundred feet and more still higher than the Washington Monument, towering above you like the prow of a great boat a mile long, its hidden mast a thousand feet high—

a monolith of natural rock, golden and brown. Steamboat Rock. Imagine the awe and wonder you feel as you place yourself before its massive stand against time and the elements.

Think, too, of the river flowing against the side, winding around the prow of this great rock—the Green River that has come through the canyon of Lodore and at Steamboat Rock has found its confluence with the Yampa, waters which have flowed through canyons which surpass, in the scenic superlatives of those who have known them, even this marvel of Steamboat Rock.

Then realize again that you and this high rock more than a mile long, with the river moving around it, and the park where you stand—all are deep in a wild canyon, and behind you as you turn are sheer walls of rock that sweep even higher than Steamboat Rock.

Climb out of these canyons onto the great plateau land in which they are cut. Walk out along the edges of the chasm, on Harpers Corner. Stand on this tongue of solid rock that holds you 2,000 feet above the river. And see the abyss to the right and left and straight ahead of you.

Turn right and see far below you Steamboat Rock that awed you in its presence. See the river flowing around it. Trace its course on up the stream, and the course of the Yampa River's canyon as it winds to its confluence with the Green there in Echo Park.

Turn to your left. Find yourself looking straight downstream between the narrow walls of Whirlpool Canyon, and the rough river, deep in the chasm, so apparently quiet from your height.

Try to tell yourself that there before you, deep below you, the United States Bureau of Reclamation—our Bureau of Reclamation—wants to build a dam 525 feet high above that river. The Echo Park Dam. And up to its concrete foot would come the reservoir waters eventually of another dam—Split Mountain—inundating those whirlpool rapids.

Turn again to your right and imagine the reservoir waters impounded by that dam. Imagine Echo Park inundated. See nothing of Steamboat Rock but a stone island in a storage basin deep almost as the Washington Monument is high.

Think of the rivers and the canyon-bottom riverside camp spots above Echo Park, buried in the waters of that basin—along the Green's marvelous Canyon of Lodore, and along the deep meanders of the Yampa—that great gorge twisting through colored rock around its sequence of bends, loops, and curves. Think of the unique, wild, river-running recreation in these canyons, the like of which is nowhere else, flooded out forever by miles and miles of a storage reservoir.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that you thus have as good an idea as I can give you here of what I believe is the essential reason why the Congress should not authorize this proposed dam building at Echo Park.

It would destroy one of the unique, irreplaceable, scenic, wild wonders of the world.

This great beautiful area that you view from Harpers Corner and wherein you stood at Echo Park—this marvelous wild scenic area in our national park system is what the Bureau of Reclamation's Director for this region calls, with an admiration of his own, "the remarkable storage vessel at Echo Park."

As you turn then in imagination from Harpers Corner and make the hike back to your parking place, and the long wild-road drive back to the transcontinental highway (U. S. 40), you realize that you are within the Dinosaur National Monument—part of America's national park system, a system of a few superlative parts of America dedicated for preservation while all the rest is free for all man's purposes. You begin to feel a pro-

fanity in this dam proposal, a threat posed to all such areas you hold sacred, a challenge to the very idea of holding sacred any part of the natural earth.

Driving through the plateau land within the national park area that surrounds these canyon chasms, and sensing the violence that would be done to all this wilderness by the very construction itself—\$200 million of sand and gravel and concrete, roads and trucks, men and materials, steel, and the noise of drills and dynamite, man's mighty power in bulldozer and all his great tools—you begin to realize that you are in the midst of a great debate over the very idea of preserving natural parks.

Will you dam the scenic wild canyons of the national park system?

That is the question.

The proponents of the dam tell you that it was understood when the area was established that such a dam could be built, but you look at the proclamation establishing the monument and read that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." You find that the Browns Park site is far up the Green River near the northern edge of the monument, many miles up the river from the now proposed Echo Park site. You understand why the possible construction of this Browns Park Dam could have been allowed, and you understand, too, that this proclamation can never be distorted into a true justification for constructing the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams in the heart of the monument, creating reservoirs along practically all of the area's scenic canyons which it was set aside to preserve. You recognize this new proposal as clearly an encroachment on a duly designated national park area.

You hear the proponents of these dams in the monument claim that the reservoirs will themselves provide recreation and attract many people, but you know that such recreation will anyhow be afforded by other reservoirs outside the monument, while the wild-canyon experiences of the unspoiled wilderness cannot be duplicated.

For, finally (I trust), you realize that these national park sites are not needed for reservoirs. The reservoirs can be built elsewhere, with all their advantages to the people of the Colorado River Basin and indeed to the people of the Nation, which we all appreciate. You hear an alternative program outlined, see its feasibility, hear its various features debated.

You see the proponents of the Dinosaur dams, nevertheless, build pretexts into arguments, and you realize after all that not necessity but supposed advantage tempts these would-be dam builders into the national park system.

Evaporation differences at various sites are pointed to in the 83d Congress as a compulsion to build dams in the Dinosaur National Monument, a compulsion that is yielded to reluctantly because it would do damage to an area that would preferably be preserved in its natural condition but for these evaporation-loss differences.

Then as the evaporation-loss differences appear in some cases at least to be much less than estimated earlier, the evaporation-loss argument seems itself to have been dissipated in thin air. Yet a new argument arises to prominence, and the reservoir anticipated by the proponents of the Echo Park Dam is urged not reluctantly because it would do damage to this marvelous area but because (and I am quoting from the brochure Tomorrow's Playground for Millions of Americans published by the Upper Colorado River Commission):

"Only by storing and putting to beneficial use the river waters which run through it, by approval of a combined reclamation-power

project like the one proposed, can Echo Park and surrounding country truly become a park."

Thus the very nature of our preservation effort in the National Park System is threatened. Those with contrary concepts that better suit their other purposes are urging upon us a policy that would not leave our National Park System unimpaired as envisioned by Congress when this system was established but would rather develop and improve and adapt these areas to purposes that Congress after Congress and administration after administration have considered inconsistent with national-park principles.

The challenge is a challenge to the concept and integrity of the national park system.

I do wish to be understood as being interested in the welfare and prosperity of this great upper Colorado region of our country and its people. Just as I have come to value the privilege of visiting this region and breathing a little deeper in its outdoors, so also I have valued the privilege of knowing the people who live there. I value highly their hospitality and friendship. I share their aspirations, and wish accordingly to be understood as approaching this controversy with hope and confidence that it will be so resolved as not only to preserve the areas which have been set aside for preservation but also to provide for the wise development of the region.

I have been particularly sensitive to the claim that we who oppose the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam proposals are in danger of breaking faith with the people of this region.

I have read with deep interest David H. Madsen's March 27, 1950, affidavit regarding the June 11, 1936, and June 13, 1936, public meetings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., at which, he testified, he then authoritatively stated as a representative of the National Park Service "that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power or irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Colorado and Utah, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

I have read also with deep interest the March 27, 1950, affidavits by J. A. Chaney, Joseph Haslem, Leo Calder, H. E. Seeley, and B. H. Stringham regarding one or both of these meetings, at which they said, each with the same words, that "the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes."

It has been pointed out by others that such assurance could not have been given responsibly and authoritatively, because the letter of instructions from the Secretary of the Interior of June 8, 1936, expressly prohibited the National Park Service from making commitments on the subject of water development at the hearings. Nevertheless, I have still been disposed, personally, to have a regard for these discussions testified to by Mr. Madsen and these other residents of Utah, to try to look at this situation from the viewpoint of these people's own understanding, and to feel a moral responsibility to respect such agreements as were understood.

Yet I am without any belief whatever that any such agreements justify approval of the Echo Park or Split Mountain Dams.

The outcome of the discussions and considerations of which these meetings and so-called agreements were a part was the proclamation establishing the Dinosaur National Monument as we know it today.

We have in this country what I believe is an excellent democratic process of discussing extensively (and intensively) all as-

pects of any proposed public action. Then we resolve our various points of view in some definite action. We adopt a constitution. We enact a law. We have a presidential proclamation. And then we pass on to future discussions of other problems with our past discussions and agreements made formal and finally resolved in writing—for our clear understanding not only at the time but in the future.

Such was the Presidential Proclamation of 1938. Some 2 years after the 1936 public hearings and following various governmental considerations, this proclamation enlarged the monument and at the same time included and defined the public understanding regarding reservoir projects, as follows:

"This reservation * * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project."

There is no evidence of any dissatisfaction with this statement—no evidence at all that provision for the Brown's Park Reservoir site was not an adequate recognition of such assurances as were understood. The proclamation's reservation is specific. It applies to a site and an area many miles up the river from the sites now being argued. And Congress by appropriating for and providing for the administration of the monument has in effect, repeatedly endorsed this proclamation. I can only conclude that we have in this respect no obligation to the people of this region other than our obligation to respect this proclamation's provision that the administration of the area is subject to a prior withdrawal for the Brown's Park Reservoir site. As Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay himself said, in my hearing, tapping the edge of his desk with his index finger, "Just because I give somebody permission to do something at this desk, it doesn't mean that he can do it anywhere in the room." Wrong as Secretary McKay is, in my opinion, in supporting the Echo Park Dam proposal, he does recognize that it is not authorized in the proclamation that establishes the national monument.

I also have been deeply interested in the implications of the proclamation's provision that "this reservation * * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended."

I am aware that in a memorandum published on page 719 and the following pages of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 4449, H. R. 4443, and H. R. 4463, Mr. George W. Abbott, counsel for the committee, concluded that the Federal Power Commission, in accordance with this provision of the proclamation, has the authority to license the construction of a dam in the canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument. Yet after a careful study of this contention I am persuaded that, on the contrary, only Congress has the authority to authorize such a dam and furthermore that such an authorization by Congress would be a departure from a policy in protection of national parks and monuments which Congress set in 1921, renewed and strengthened in 1935, and has ever since respected.

Here are the facts and my understanding of them that lead me to this conclusion:

The Dinosaur National Monument, in eastern Utah and northwestern Colorado, established on October 4, 1915, by proclamation of President Woodrow Wilson for the protection of the dinosaur quarry, was originally only 80 acres in size and did not include the canyons of the Green and Yampa

Rivers until the monument was enlarged by 203,885 acres on July 14, 1938, by proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for the protection of these canyons.

The Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, in section 4 (d) authorized the Federal Power Commission "to issue licenses * * * for the purpose of constructing * * * dams * * * upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States * * *" and in section 3 defined "reservations" to include "national monuments" and "national parks."

By an act of March 3, 1921, however, Congress amended the Federal Power Commission's authority under this Federal Water Power Act of 1920 to the effect "that hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits as now constituted of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of June 10, 1920 * * * as authorizes licensing such uses of existing national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed."

By this 1921 amendment Congress established a fundamental national policy from which it has never departed—providing an immunity for national parks and national monuments from the construction of dams.

The legislative history leaves no doubt as to the purpose of the 1921 amendment. In Senate debate on the amendment, Mr. Walsh of Montana said, "I understand that (the bill) was introduced by the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jones) for the purpose of eliminating national parks from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission." Mr. Jones of Washington replied "that is correct."

It is true, as Mr. Abbott points out, that the 1921 amendment was confined to "existing" national parks and monuments, and to the areas "as now constituted." A reasonable interpretation was that the Federal Power Commission's authority would extend to any national parks or monuments enlarged or created in the future—unless Congress decided otherwise at the time.

The proponents of the 1921 amendment reluctantly made this concession to the Federal Power Commission in order to assure passage of the bill. They recognized that it was more important to assure the establishment of the national policy as to the parks and monuments as then constituted, and fight out the issue again, when new parks were created or present ones enlarged, than to risk delay in amending the 1920 act.

In House debate, Mr. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, said:

"As the bill passed the Senate and as it was reported to the House, it limited its effect to existing national parks only, so that hereafter, if more national parks shall be created, or those already in existence shall be enlarged, we must fight out on every individual bill creating a new national park or enlarging one already in existence the question whether the water power in the national park shall be used. It was my thought that we ought to make this provision apply to all parks that exist now as well as those that may be created in the future; but if the House feels that such an amendment would endanger the passage of this bill and thinks it is better to get what we can under this bill than to try to get more, I have no disposition to offer an amendment. I do desire, however, to register my objection to the provision that limits it to existing national parks instead of including all that may hereafter be created."

Mr. BARKLEY proved to be farsighted; the policy established by the 1921 amendment has never been abandoned.

By an act of August 20, 1935, the Federal Power Commission's authority to license the construction of dams on "public lands and reservations of the United States" was significantly amended once again. This time the definition of "reservations" was changed, to provide specifically that the term "shall not include national monuments or national parks."

This unequivocal language restricting the Federal Power Commission's fundamental authority would seem to leave no room for interpretation. Its purpose was made doubly clear in Senate Report 1318, 74th Congress, 1st session, which stated at page 22:

"The definition of the former term ('reservations') has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under the amendment of the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of 'reservations' is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses."

It may be emphasized that the only "suggestion of authority" to be removed was in the phrase "as now constituted" and the word "existing" of the 1921 amendment.

As clear as the 1935 amendment is in language and purpose, Mr. Abbott argues in his memorandum that the new definition of "reservations" does not mean what it says. He argues that the language "shall not include national monuments or national parks" really means "shall not include the parks in existence on March 3, 1921, as then constituted." This conclusion is reached by a strained interpretation of a further provision in the 1935 act which provided:

"Nothing in the Federal Water Power Act, as amended, shall be construed to repeal or amend the provisions of the amendment to the Federal Water Power Act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353), or the provisions of any other act relating to national parks and national monuments."

The purpose of this provision in the 1935 act was stated as follows by its author, Mr. Crosser, of Ohio, who said in the House debate:

"The national parks organization wants to make sure that the bill does not infringe upon their preserves, so to speak. We are offering this at their request."

The provision, offered at the request of the national parks organization, is construed by Mr. Abbott in a way that nullifies the plain meaning of the language that redefined reservations so as to exclude national parks and monuments. The purpose of the provision submitted by Mr. Crosser of Ohio certainly was not to preserve any authority of the Federal Power Commission to license the building of dams in parks or monuments, past or present. On the contrary, its purpose was to make it doubly clear that Congress subscribed to the policy of protecting national parks and monuments from invasion by dams.

Mr. Abbott contends that the purpose of the Crosser provision was to continue the effect of the language as now constituted and existing, which actually was eliminated by the 1935 act. It is inconceivable that this was the purpose of the Crosser provision. To construe it so against the interests and purposes of its sponsor, the national parks organization, would be ironical indeed. The redefinition of reservations removed any suggestion of Federal Power Commission authority over national parks or monuments. To argue that the Crosser provision was designed to reinsert such a suggestion is surely a distortion of legislative intent.

Thus the provisions in the Presidential proclamation of July 14, 1938, that "this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended," could not possibly give the Federal Power Commission au-

thority to license construction of a dam in the enlarged area of Dinosaur National Monument. Any such authority of the Federal Power Commission may be conferred only by Congress, and Congress determined in 1935 that the Commission could not license the construction of dams in any national monument. To deviate from this well established national policy would set a dangerous precedent.

I am confident, therefore, both with regard to reclamation and power withdrawals, we are in no sense breaking faith with the people of Utah and Colorado and the other States of the upper Colorado region in urging that the preservation of this area be continued by Congress, and strengthened.

In emphasizing this I should like also, in as friendly a fashion as possible, to remind the people of Utah and Colorado, that all of us from all parts of the country share with them the public ownership of this unit in our National Park System. I would appeal to them to recognize that they share also a responsibility to all of us for its protection.

I recognize that our national welfare depends on the welfare of this region, and I feel that my own personal welfare is related to the personal welfare of fellow citizens in Utah and Colorado. I am interested in the national importance of the upper Colorado River program for the benefit of this region and its people. At the same time, I would urge all of them to keep faith with all of us throughout the Nation, and with those of future generations, by cherishing these scenic wild canyons and helping to preserve them unimpaired.

It is important, I believe, in discussing these so-called agreements and our various obligations, regional and national, to recognize that the Dinosaur National Monument was created out of lands that already belonged to the Nation, public domain that belonged to all of us. In some parts of our country private lands have been purchased for, and State lands have been turned over to the Federal Government for the creation of national parks. Those who have lived near these areas have given such parks to the Nation. Here, the Nation, already in ownership of this public domain, merely dedicated it for a special use of all the Nation—including the people of Utah and Colorado who indeed are in a preferred location—as one of the superbly beautiful parts of the land to become a part of the National Park System.

The purpose of the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument, it is clear, is to preserve the marvelous wild canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers. The shape of the monument, as readily seen on the map, shows that this is the purpose, its size being that which is necessary to preserve and protect properly these canyons. Only so much as was needed for this purpose was thus reserved, out of our own public domain, and set aside from the normal commodity uses that are made by local residents of other parts of the public domain or of the private lands which they own or rent.

During the public debate that followed the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal of this Echo Park Dam some 5 years ago, it has been clearly shown, I believe, not only that (1) the scenic wild canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument are superb and unique, a wilderness resource irreplaceable, invaluable, and increasingly popular, but also (2) that it is not necessary to destroy this national monument in order to realize the purposes of the upper Colorado River project. Others have spoken, and will yet speak, in greater detail and with better understanding of alternative programs. All of us conservationists have shown real interest in them. Far from wishing to enforce any denial of water storage or power potential on the people of the region, we have extended ourselves to demonstrate that there can be a program that will serve all public purposes, including

national park preservation. Neither evaporation loss, which was once officially described as the fundamental issue, nor any other supposed sacrifice, I am sincerely convinced, will ever become any severe penalty on the people of Utah and Colorado for the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument. I am confident that in no way will they eventually regret joining with all of us in its preservation.

In the Living Wilderness, the quarterly magazine which I edit for the Wilderness Society, we have devoted earnest attention during the past 5 years to the presentation of information about the Dinosaur National Monument and its preservation within a successful program for the upper Colorado River storage project. In addition to numerous news items with maps and photographs we have published a number of articles of feature length. In our autumn 1950 magazine we published General Grant's definitive discussion with the title "The Dinosaur Dam Sites Are Not Needed." In this same magazine we published Margaret E. Murie's appreciation of the national monument entitled "A Matter of Choice," which concluded: "Water, yes, for those dry States. By all means. But, what if it can be had in some other way than by damming up the beautiful canyons of the Green and the Yampa in this particular 'convenient' spot." Mrs. Murie quoted Robert Browning:

"Oh, if we draw a circle premature
Hedless of far gain,
Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
Bad is our bargain."

In the autumn 1950 magazine we also included Mildred E. Baker's "Lifelong Inspiration," recalling her 1940 trip on the Green River. These Autumn 1950 articles were combined later in a special reprint entitled "The Dinosaur Dam Case," a copy of which is herewith submitted for the committee's files, and additional copies of which will be gladly supplied. There similarly is submitted a reprint of Philip Hyde's article "Nature's Climax at Dinosaur" which we were privileged to publish with a selection of Mr. Hyde's brilliant photographs and a special map by W. Frederick Freund in the Living Wilderness for Autumn 1952.

We have sought to emphasize, not only that the upper Colorado River program can be realized along with the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument, but also that our only way of preserving any such areas throughout our land is by dedicating them and not allowing any destruction.

Our whole American policy for preserving some of our wilderness is, in fact, based on two understandings that are here involved.

On the one hand is the understanding that our land and water resources are great enough and varied enough to make possible the preservation of a system of wilderness areas without sacrificing the commodity production and other uses that make it necessary to develop most of our areas.

On the other hand, our wilderness preservation program is based on the understanding that our civilization is such that no lands will persist unexploited except those that are deliberately set aside and faithfully protected.

For this policy to prevail we must be faithful in respecting our dedications, for otherwise the dedicated areas will inevitably disappear one by one as it seems profitable to exploit them. We cannot merely set aside an area until we get to it with some kind of exploitation project without defrauding both our own and future generations.

To permit the would-be exploiters of Dinosaur National Monument to build the Echo Park and Split Mountains dams would certainly jeopardize this public policy of national park preservation. Rather than place this great and brilliant policy of the American people in such jeopardy let us instead strengthen it by reasserting our ad-

herence to it and our determination that it must be respected. If we turn back now this threatened invasion, by reaffirming the sanctity of the areas which the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can be sure that the whole national system of parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas will, indeed, be safeguarded more surely than ever.

We cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound.

I would, therefore, recommend:

(1) That the Echo Park Dam be deleted from any of the bills now under consideration which the subcommittee may consider for approval and that the Echo Park Dam be omitted from any authorization recommended for approval;

(2) That any bill recommended for passage by Congress include a provision that the Glen Canyon project be so constructed that it shall not impair the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, a protection that we are assured by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior can be provided but one that should be specified by Congress as a requirement; and

(3) That any bill authorizing an upper Colorado project should include a provision that no project constructed under the authorization of this act shall be built within, or impair any of the natural features within, any area within the national park system.

Thus, not only does it seem possible to see authorized a sound project for the development and conservation of the water resources of the upper Colorado River region, but also, by reaffirming here in Congress the sanctity of the areas that the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can resolve this long controversy in such a manner as to make more secure than ever our great American policy for preserving some areas of our land forever wild and unspoiled in their natural beauty and grandeur.

It will be an achievement that I am sure will bring us the gratitude of American citizens during a long, long future, an accomplishment that all of us, I am sure, will be well satisfied to share. As I said before, we cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, stripped of all its complexity, the upper Colorado River storage project is designed to put water on the parched lands and into the water-hungry economy of Utah and the other upper Colorado Basin States—Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. It is water which rightfully belongs to us under the Colorado River compact of 1922, which apportioned the waters of the Colorado River and which was approved by the Congress.

It is a project of immense importance to the Nation, as shown by the strong support given by President Eisenhower and his administration. He recognizes that we cannot postpone development of our water resources in the arid Western States. His keen understanding was shown in a letter which he sent to be in September of 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., September 8, 1954.
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I appreciated your August 5 letter respecting an affirmative reclamation program which is so important

to the Western States and the Nation generally.

I regret that some should feel that this administration has not sought to further a sound reclamation program. Recently a Cabinet Committee on Water Resources was appointed to make a complete review and submit recommendations on all major problems in this important field. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, established in the first session of the 83d Congress, also has included water resources in its studies. These efforts should lead to the formulation of a comprehensive and progressive water policy acceptable to the Congress.

The need for such reviews is evident, but we cannot afford to suspend all resources development until they are completed. The Colorado River storage project is a case in point. It is well conceived as proposed in the administration plan, which takes into full account the interests of the areas affected, both upstream and downstream. I consider the plan in this form to be essential to the proper development of the great intermountain region. I have so expressed my views publicly; the Secretary of the Interior also has urged the project on many occasions and in many places. Very unfortunately, action on it was not completed by the 83d Congress, but it is now much better understood as a result of legislative work already done, and I am confident that the 84th Congress will approve it.

In the future, I shall continue to support Secretary McKay's administration of a sound, progressive reclamation program and will count on your continued vigorous sponsorship of legislative proposals essential to the success of our recommendations.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the project, however, is a nonpartisan development enjoying the support of both parties in Utah and the upper basin.

Former President Herbert Hoover has shown also an acute perception concerning the foregoing problems, as well he might, for he served as Chairman of the Colorado River Commission. He portrayed the problems in a letter written in 1945 to former Senator Albert Hawkes, of New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this letter may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As you know, I had the honor to be Chairman of the Colorado River Commission which settled the Colorado River compact in 1922 and other matters relating to the development of the river. During the following years I had many duties involving these questions. * * * In 1922 there was general agreement that the allocation of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum to the upper basin would be more than ample to meet their requirements. * * * It is now realized that the allocation will fall far short of ultimate needs of the upper basin. * * * In 1922 the compact requirement that the upper States never deplete the flow of the river to less than 75 million acre-feet in any 10-year period was not considered burdensome. Studies now available show that to meet this obligation the upper States will have to provide at least 20 million acre-feet of holdover storage to be used during low-flow periods, comparable to 1931-40, or lacking storage, will have to limit their use to about 64 percent of their allocation, in order to make available 75 million acre-feet at Lee Ferry.

WATER: OUR PARAMOUNT RESOURCE—THE COLORADO RIVER: UTAH'S LAST WATER SOURCE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, to us in the semiarid upper Colorado River Basin and in all of my own State of Utah, water is our paramount resource. Our water problem is all too serious to us in Utah, particularly as we contemplate the forbidding fact that virtually all of our available water has been, or will be, put to use in the near future. This, in general, is the plight of the whole upper basin.

The progress of our entire region, with our immense minerals and industrial potential, an expanding agriculture, and the growth of our cities, all hinges directly on the future availability of more water. Without water, our growth will be stunted; with water, a great new era of development lies before us—an era of benefit to the entire Nation.

The same recognition of the relative importance of water in the scheme of things in the West was realized by the pioneers who first entered Utah. Irrigation was begun almost immediately while the colonizers were instructed by Brigham Young to forgo mineral development, even during the height of the 1849 gold rush. The purpose was obvious—the settlers must first have a solid economic base. As we all know, mining was to come into its own, but water and farming came first.

UTAH AND THE PROJECT

In agricultural development, to evaluate properly the upper Colorado River project, it is necessary to view the tremendous potential of the area. Because I am best acquainted with Utah, I shall confine my remarks largely to my State.

At the present time, less than 2.2 percent of the land in the State of Utah is irrigated. Of the 1 million acres currently under irrigation, fully 60 percent, or 600,000 acres, has only a periodic supply of water and undergoes severe shortages annually. Utah's farmers, most of whom run small farms, need the water with its invigorating impact, which can come alone from ultimate development of the central Utah, Gooseberry, and Emery projects.

Mr. President, I have prepared a table showing the number of acres which may be irrigated, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects	Acres of new land irrigated	Supplemental acres irrigated	Total acreage
Central Utah-----	28,500	132,000	160,500
Emery County-----	3,630	20,450	24,080
Gooseberry-----		16,400	16,400
Total-----	32,130	168,850	200,980

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is hoped that with ultimate development of Utah's share of the Colorado waters, the total of new irrigated land will be about 210,000 acres, and that furnished supplemental water, 250,000 acres. This

will still leave nearly one-half million acres in the Colorado and Bonneville basins needing either a full or partial supply of water.

The crops produced in Utah are not in competition with the major crops of the Nation, so the development would not contribute to the present surpluses. Except for fruits, vegetables, sugarbeets, and canning crops, our agricultural production is harvested through livestock. Moreover, it will take from 10 to 20 years to get the projects into operation. It is likely that any increase in production will be consumed locally by Utah's rapidly increasing population.

I have received from the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, a letter which points out that, on the basis of findings by the Agricultural Research Service, by 1975 we will be approximately 167 million acres short of land to produce enough food and forage to supply the population expected at that time.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from Secretary Benson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
Washington, March 28, 1955.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate.

DEAR WALLACE: This is in response to a telephone request from a member of your staff indicating that you would like some information concerning the estimated increase in farm production necessary to provide food and fiber for the expected population increase by 1975.

Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of our Agricultural Research Service, recently discussed this matter before the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. His estimates are as follows:

Based on population estimates made by the Bureau of the Census, Dr. Shaw believes that by 1975 we will need production from 167 million acres more land than we are now using. He assumes that 45 million acres can be brought into production through irrigation, drainage, land clearing, and the release of land from growing horse and mule feed. This would leave a deficit of 122 million acres that would have to be made up through improved technology (increased output per acre). Our research figures indicate that improvements in crop yields per acre have been slowing down in recent years.

Thus it would appear safe to assume that by 1975 we will need for agricultural production in the United States all of the new land that can be safely and efficiently brought into production. In addition to that, our research will have to keep pace to provide the increased output per acre.

I hope that this information will be of some benefit to you.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture has been further substantiated by an article entitled "Food and Fiber Outlook for the Future versus Current Farm Surpluses," written by Dr. Jewell J. Rasmussen, and published in the Utah Economic and Business Review for March, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that

the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**FOOD AND FIBER OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE
VERSUS CURRENT FARM SURPLUSES**

(By Dr. Jewell J. Rasmussen)

One of the most important issues with respect to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects concerns the use of reclamation to bring in new farmland while the Nation is plagued with the problem of surpluses under the farm price support program. Specifically, the question is: Why invest large amounts of Federal money in projects which bring new lands into production by irrigation or other reclamation means at the same time that the Federal Government is spending large sums to support farm prices under seemingly overproduction on existing lands?

Standing alone, this argument overlooks the multipurpose aspects of water resources development and ignores the importance of controlling and regulating such mighty streams as the Colorado River. Apart from this aspect of the problem, however, the basic question posed above should and can be answered from the narrower standpoint of agricultural production.

In attempting to answer this question, it is necessary to consider such factors as (1) changes in the productivity of land, (2) population trends as an indication of future requirements, (3) the relation of improved diets to changes in food consumption, (4) future feed requirements for horses and mules, and (5) export possibilities. Careful analysis of these factors was made by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950 with illuminating results for the Colorado River and similar projects.¹

CHANGES IN PRODUCTIVITY

The Commission found that from 1910 until the late thirties, there were no substantial changes in per acre yields on American farms. Then, as a result of a combination of factors, including the greater use of fertilizer and lime, improved varieties of plants, control of insects and disease, shifting high-producing crops to better lands, improved soil building and conservation practices, and further mechanization of farms, crop yields increased sharply. Average wheat yields during 1945-49 were one-fourth higher than in 1920-39; corn yields were up about one-third; and hay yields increased 10 percent. In addition, improvements in the food value of hay contributed to an increase of 15 to 20 percent in production per animal unit.

Further improvements in farm technology will undoubtedly result in a continuation of the upward trend in per acre production. Of course, there are also limiting factors on the full benefits of improved technology such as the lag between the development and use of improved production techniques and the absence of proper soil management. The Commission concluded that:

"In view of all these considerations it seems probable that average per acre yields will continue to increase over at least the next quarter century although the rate of increase may be somewhat less rapid than during the past decade."

POPULATION TRENDS

An important aspect of the decision to reclaim more agricultural land through irrigation is the size and location of the popu-

lation. Since 1940 there has been a significant reversal of the previous decline in the rate of population increase. On the basis of a medium projection, the Bureau of the Census has forecast a population of about 170 million in 1960 and 190 million in 1975.² With an estimated population of 163.9 million on January 1, 1955, the above forecast for 1960 will undoubtedly be exceeded by perhaps seven to eight million.

Of special significance to the Colorado River Storage project and the participating projects is the rapid growth of population in the West. Between 1940 and 1950 the population of the 11 Western States increased 40.4 percent, while the Nation increased only 14.4 percent. The estimated population of the 11 Western States in 1960 (medium projection) will be some 78-80 percent greater than it was in 1940, while the Nation will gain only about 28-30 percent. The gain of the Mountain States alone between 1940 and 1960 will be at least 44 percent, and individually all Western States except three will have gains considerably in excess of the national average.

The significance of these population trends was very carefully considered by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950. With reference to the Western States, the Commission stated:

"The existence of these large populations in relatively undeveloped areas will require new farm production, as well as industrial production in nearby locations. The new production can be developed smoothly, if plans for it are formulated promptly. Such plans should be carried out under the basin development planning which the Commission is recommending."

With reference to the Nation as a whole, the Commission took the position that the real agricultural problem is how to assure sufficient production to meet the requirements of an expanding population. * * *

CHANGES IN THE AMERICAN DIET

Per capita food consumption remained fairly stable during the 25 years prior to the late 1930's. But the increased output of food in the following decade permitted an increase in per capita consumption of about 15 percent above 1935-39. In addition, changes in what Americans eat will also affect cropland requirements for the future. The proportion of grain products and potatoes has declined by about one-third since 1909-14, the proportion of livestock products has increased about 10 percent, and the proportion of fruit, vegetables, and other foods has gone up nearly 50 percent.

These dietary trends are a shift to a more adequate and more palatable diet and are very likely to continue inasmuch as diet improvement is due more to rising income than to any other factor, and real per capita income in the United States is steadily rising. On this point, the following statement of the Commission is pertinent:

"In spite of the bumper crops of recent years, there are still large numbers of the population whose diets are not adequate in nutrition or palatability. Some of the deficiency is due to lack of knowledge and some to habit. But most of it can be attributed to inadequate income."

The shift in diet toward the proportionate consumption of more livestock products and fruits and vegetables is also a shift to higher per capita land requirements. When crops go into livestock production rather than directly into human consumption, relatively more land is required because the calorie

production per acre is decreased, although other nutritive factors are increased. The shift to fruits and vegetables also increases the cropland requirement, but not as much as does the shift to livestock products. It is especially important to note, however, that the shift to fruits and vegetables increases the demand for irrigated land.

EXPORT POSSIBILITIES

The amount of land needed for future agricultural exports is very uncertain. In the past, the acreage was varied from 55 million acres in 1920-24 to as low as 15 million acres in 1941, with an average of 48 million acres for the period of 1945-49. The Commission estimated in 1950 that the acreage needed for export production may drop from the present 50 million acres, leveling off at about 40 million.

CROPLAND NEEDED FOR WORKSTOCK

Acreage needed to produce feed for horses and mules declined from 90 million in 1910 to 30 million cropland acres in 1949. Studies by the United States Department of Agriculture indicates that by 1975 there will be only half as many horses and mules in use as there were in 1950. This reduction will release additional acreage for human use.

REMOTE CROPLAND REQUIREMENTS

On the basis of the preceding analysis and certain assumptions, it is possible to project the national cropland requirements for future years. The Commission made such projections for 1960 and 1975, assuming the average diet and production per acre remained about the same as in the 1945-49 period. Table 1 shows these projections.

From the table it is seen that the estimated cropland requirements will be some 99 million acres greater in 1975 than in 1945-49. If an adequate diet were made available to the whole population, it might require up to a 15-percent increase in cropland requirements, which would be about 96 million acres in 1975. An increase in per-acre yields would, of course, correspondingly reduce the acreage requirements.

TABLE 1.—Projected acreage requirements for 1960 and 1975 (assuming 1945-49 consumption levels and acre yields)

	1945-49	1960	1975
Population (millions).....	144	169	190
Cropland requirements (millions of acres):			
For human consumption:			
From cropland ¹	297	348	391
From pasture (cropland equivalent) ²	127	149	167
Total.....	424	497	558
For export.....	48	40	40
For horse and mule feed:			
From cropland.....	30	18	12
From pasture (cropland equivalent).....	15	9	6
Idle cropland.....	25	25	25
Total cropland acreage or equivalent.....	542	589	641

¹ Requirements for domestic consumption of food, fiber, tobacco, and feed for livestock products. Excludes double cropping; includes 25 million acres for fallow and crop failure. Per capita acreage equals 297 divided by 144 equals 2.06. Requirements for 1960 and 1975 calculated by applying this figure to population projections.

² Total cropland equivalent of pasture, 142 million acres minus cropland equivalent of pasture for horses and mules equals 127 million acres. Per capita requirements equals 127 divided by 144 equals 0.88. Requirements for 1960 and 1975 calculated by applying this figure to population projections.

Source: The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 159.

MEETING INCREASED REQUIREMENTS

If the above estimates of future requirements are realistic and defensible, then the present food surpluses are transitory, and

¹ The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, *A Water Policy for the American People*, vol. I (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950).

² Margaret J. Hagood and Jacob S. Siegel, *Projections of the Regional Distribution of the Population of the United States to 1975*, Agricultural Economics Research, III (April 1951), p. 43.

about 100 million additional cropland acres will be needed by 1975. This increased agricultural production can come only from four major sources: (1) increasing production from existing farmlands, (2) bringing new lands into production through all forms of reclamation, (3) importing more from other countries, and (4) reduced future feed requirements for workstock. A possible additional source is "hydroponic" farming or nutriculture. Hydroponic gardens are shallow, gravel-lined beds through which chemical plant-feeding solutions are circulated. This method of vegetable production has been practiced to a very limited extent in Puerto Rico and Florida, and by the United States Army in Japan and other Pacific islands. The future of this source of supply depends on relative cost which is very uncertain.

Continuation or acceleration of the soil conservation program logically can be expected to result in increased farm output in the years ahead. However, the results of the program will not be all gain. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that about half of the present cropland is subject to erosion. Some of this land, perhaps as much as 50 million acres, might well be retired to grass and trees in the next 20 to 25 years. The major gains from soil conservation are expected in hay and grazing which will result primarily in increased livestock production. In summarizing the net gains from soil conservation, the Commission concluded:

"It is probable, therefore, that the soil conservation program, if effectively carried out during the next 25 years, can be depended upon to do no more than take care of the increased demands due to the correlative improvement in diet, insofar as that involves increased consumption of livestock products. The correlative increased demand for fruits and vegetables will have to be taken care of by other means, including reclamation. In other words, the 1975 requirements for an additional 100 million cropland acres is still to be provided for."

Of the projected requirements of 100 million additional cropland acres by 1975, it has been estimated that about 30 million equivalent acres could come from reclamation projects—about 6 million acres of newly irrigated land, which are the equivalent of 9 million of nonirrigated land, plus the equivalent of 21 million acres of ordinary farmland reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection. The ultimate acreage suitable for development for agricultural use through flood control, drainage, and clearing has been estimated at 75 million acres, which is the equivalent of about 43 million acres of new cropland of average yields. In addition, it has been estimated that ultimately about 25 million equivalent cropland acres could be developed by irrigation.³ (Much more irrigable land exists, of course, than can be irrigated with available water supplies.) Total equivalent cropland acreage considered susceptible of development through reclamation was thus estimated by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission to be about 68 million acres. Table 2 summarizes these estimates.

³ This estimate is based upon the following factors: "Yields from irrigated lands are, on the average, about 50 percent higher than from nonirrigated land. Delivery of additional water to already irrigated lands increases the yields by about one-third of the yield of irrigated lands. Pasture is also reckoned as about a third as productive as irrigated cropland." President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 160.

TABLE 2.—Agricultural production potentials

Type of potential	Considered susceptible of development ¹	
	By 1975	Ultimate
Irrigation.....	9.0	25.0
Flood protection.....	3.5	4.3
Flood protection, drainage, and land clearing.....	3.8	14.6
Drainage and land clearing.....	² 11.2	14.4
Land clearing.....	2.0	8.0
Subtotal.....	29.5	68.3
Improved technology: ³		
Moderate increase.....	46.0	-----
Substantial increase.....	77.0	-----

¹ Expressed in millions of acres of average cropland equivalent.

² Based on the assumption that the present rate of drainage and land clearing development would be expanded as a result of Federal activity.

³ Based on a cropland equivalent acreage of 542 million less 40 million acres for land to be removed permanently from the cropland base, and productivity indexes of 110 and 118 compared to acreage production for the 5-year period 1945 to 1949. The index of 118 is equivalent to 150 for the 5-year period 1935 to 1939. Ultimate improvement in technology is not estimated.

Source: President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 165.

The provision of about 30 million equivalent cropland acres through reclamation by 1975 would still leave about 70 million equivalent acres to be provided through other means. The estimate of the needed additional acreage in 1975 (100 million cropland acres) takes into account the reduced need for feed for horses and mules (see table 1). The net export acreage is assumed to remain about constant. Hence, the equivalent of an additional 70 million acres can be secured only through an accelerated reclamation program or through a substantial increase in the productivity of existing farmlands.

The Commission projected future land requirements on the basis of two assumptions with respect to yield increases: A moderate increase assumed that in 1960 and 1975 yields would be 5 and 10 percent, respectively, above the average for the period 1945-49—increases equal to a 33- and a 40-percent increase above the average for the prewar period of 1935-39. A substantial increase assumed that in 1960 and 1975 yields would be 10 and 18 percent above the average for the period 1945-49, or 40 and 50 percent above the period 1935-39. The results of these projections of technology improvements in terms of cropland acreage are shown in table 2. It is seen that the moderate-increase projection—46 million acres—falls considerably short of the additional needed acreage of 70 million, and that the substantial-increase projection exceeds the estimated land requirements only by 10 percent.

As a result of the above analysis and projections, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission reached the following conclusions:

"On the basis of these estimates, it appears that the increased productivity of existing agricultural acreage, if added to the production available from new lands brought in by irrigation, drainage, flood control, and clearing, is likely to meet the Nation's expanding requirements over the next 25 years by a rather narrow margin. Obviously, the program for meeting those requirements must include the combined efforts of those responsible for reclamation in its various forms and those responsible for improved farming practices."

In general, this analysis has shown that reclamation of new land through irrigation, flood control, drainage, and clearing, and improvement in the use of existing farm-

lands, must move forward together if the future needs of the Nation are to be met. It tends to controvert the contention that reclamation of new lands should be curtailed because of surpluses in certain agricultural commodities.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is evident from Secretary Benson's letter that even with the reclaiming of lands, drainage of swamps, and the expansion of research, by 1975 we will still need many more thousands of acres just to feed our population. It would be most unwise not to proceed with the development of lands to meet this eventuality.

Many of Utah's towns and cities are in critical need of culinary and industrial water, particularly in central Utah. The sobering part of this picture is that virtually all of the water in these areas even now is tapped and in use.

Utah's population has increased 27 percent in the years 1940 through 1953, a growth well above the national average, and exceeded by only 10 States. Utah leads the Nation with its vital index—that is, a high birthrate and low death rate. If proportionate growth continues, the State's population will be well over a million by 1965, compared with 750,000 today, 1965 being the earliest date by which the initial phase of the central Utah project would be completed. The strain on our water resources can well be imagined if additional water is not forthcoming.

For years, one of Utah's major exports has been the trained intelligence of our young people who emigrate because of lack of job opportunities. They have enriched the Nation but it is a lamentable circumstance that they should feel obliged to leave the place of their birth, especially when it is possessed of a treasure trove of wealth and opportunity, given the vital elements of water and power. It has been estimated that Utah can support a population twice its present size if our share of Colorado River waters is made available through the full development of the central Utah, Emery County, and Gooseberry projects.

Water and power are needed for our industrial potential. It may be said without exaggeration, I believe, that Utah is the mineral storehouse of the Nation. By enlarging this statement to include the upper basin, there can be no contradiction advanced whatever. Utah is one of the most important world sources of such radioactive ores as uranium, vanadium, carnotite, and pitchblende. Together with western Colorado, the area provides the greatest domestic source for uranium. This is an area where we have a dependable supply not subject to the vagaries of political machinations abroad. Water and power are, of course, needed in the processing of these ores.

In terms of the variety of minerals from which new wealth was and is created, Utah is excelled by no other State. As processes for developing synthetic liquid fuel are perfected, the fact that Utah has 200 billion tons of coal, and that there are 800 billion tons within

350 miles of Salt Lake City, will be increasingly important. This comprises one-seventh of the world's known coal reserves.

Virtually all of the materials necessary for the development of a chemical industry are to be found in Utah, but the existing water and power supplies are not now sufficient to fully develop the great possibilities of such an industry.

Utah is one of the main producers of nonferrous metals and ranks at the top or near the top of the Nation in production of copper, zinc, lead, silver, and gold. There are great deposits of magnesium in the Great Salt Lake and in southeastern Utah, but again large amounts of water are required to obtain this metallic element.

Utah is now in the iron and steel business, with ever-increasing opportunities for satellite industries; 50,000 acre-feet of water per year is consumed at the Geneva mill, while at the same time circulating 146,000 acre-feet.

Phosphate fertilizer is critically short, and it is significant that the largest known deposits of phosphate rock are in the upper basin States. Power and water again are required.

Utah is at a critical juncture in its history with much of its future possibilities contingent directly upon water and power made available by this project. It is impossible to overdramatize our need, for it means either progress or stagnation.

CALIFORNIA HAS HAD FIRST TURN ON THE COLORADO RIVER WATERS

The Colorado River compact was signed in 1922 to divide equally the waters of the Colorado between the upper and lower basin in advance of their actual use. This was done so that southern California could commence the development of her share of the Colorado waters. The upper basin States were willing to step aside and allow southern California to develop first, providing it was agreed that the upper States could at a later date develop their half of the water. It was recognized by the people of Utah that at that time California was then climatically, geographically, and economically in a better position to proceed with irrigation and storage projects than was the upper basin. Moreover, we too were greatly concerned about the recurring floods which were then constantly menacing southern California, particularly the Imperial Valley. Consequently, we were willing to defer to southern California and give her first turn on the river.

UTAH BARGAINED IN GOOD FAITH

Had we in the upper basin States wished to be selfish in 1922, we could have effectively blocked any additional development in southern California including the Hoover Dam. However, the upper basin, in the interest of interstate comity and reasonableness, agreed to the 1922 compact. Utah and the upper basin States intend to abide by the compact. We in Utah have demonstrated our good faith by signing the compact and we have scrupulously adhered to its provisions, in the bill be-

fore the Senate. Southern California can now show her good faith by refusing to engage in further dilatory tactics and allow the project to proceed. Surely, their 33 year head start has not blunted their sense of fairness.

FIRST TURN OF INCALCULABLE VALUE TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

For a variety of reasons, the lower basin has been developed more rapidly than the upper basin, as is evidenced by such monumental works as the Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, and the All-American Canal among others. A comparison of the relative development of the two basins is most illuminating, particularly in the light of the approximate equality of development contemplated by the 1922 compact.

I have prepared a schedule showing the comparative use of water and power developed along the Colorado, as between the two basins. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colorado River water put to use:		
	(2.2 to 1 ratio)	Acre-feet annually
Lower basin	-----	5,500,000
Upper basin	-----	2,000,000
Total storage capacity of projects constructed or authorized for construction:		
	(23 to 1 ratio)	Acre-feet annually
Lower basin	-----	38,600,000
Upper basin	-----	1,700,000
Development of power by projects constructed or authorized for construction by Congress in generating capacity:		
	(53 to 1 ratio)	Kilowatts
Lower basin	-----	1,700,900
Upper basin	-----	32,000

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the overwhelming bulk of this development has been for the benefit of Southern California. Thus the lower basin has developed 53 times more generating capacity, 23 times more storage capacity, has put 2.2 more water to use, and is using more daily. In addition, millions of dollars are saved by halting the floods which previously devastated the lower Colorado, and particularly the Imperial Valley.

I wonder if our downstream neighbors really realize just what this first turn to the Colorado water and resulting power has meant to them? On the lower Colorado alone, under national reclamation law, approximately \$450 million have been invested for the development of water and power for Arizona, California, and Nevada; and when there is added to that the fact that there has been an investment in reclamation of equal magnitude on other rivers in those States, one gets the very impressive total of \$894 million.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA HAS SAVED \$1 BILLION BY HAVING FIRST TURN

But this is only half, or less than half, of the story. If these same projects were built today, at current prices, they

would cost \$1,825,000,000. In other words, the privilege of having first turn has saved our downstream neighbors a billion dollars—a billion which they will not have to pay back or pay interest on.

If the upper Colorado development project is authorized and built, we in the upper basin will have to pay back twice as much as they must for equal value. There are three ways in which our friends down river might look at this with us. First, if the development of both ends of the river had begun in the twenties, the cost to each would have been approximately equal, as our share of the water is. Second, at the prices of the twenties there would be no question of "economic feasibility." And third, even at today's prices, we can build the initial phase of the program on the upper river for the billion saved by the lower basin because they had first turn.

We in Utah have watched with pleasure the great progress made in the lower basin. We have witnessed the extensive agricultural developments, the growth of industrial developments, the population influx, and the overall increase in wealth made possible to a great extent by the utilization of the Colorado waters and the very important byproduct power.

The entire Nation has been inestimably benefited by the development of the lower basin, and there is every reason to believe a similar boon will be conferred by a corresponding development of the upper basin's share of the Colorado water. We believe that it is now our "water turn."

CONGRESS THE WATERMASTER

Out of the pioneer experiences with water there emerged a unique feature, the "watermaster," whose job it was to see that every man along the stream had his turn and his share. The Colorado River Compact of 1922 established our share, and we are now asking Congress as the watermaster to see that we get our turn.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER VERSUS ATOMIC POWER

It has been suggested by opponents of the upper Colorado River storage project that nuclear fuel will shortly displace hydroelectric and steam power. It is urged, therefore, that the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams would be obsolete before they are paid for.

While I was looking forward with great hope to rapid development of atomic power, I think that it would be imprudent and most unwise to summarily halt further hydropower and steam development.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to present to the Senate committee, while it was holding hearings on the bill, a letter signed by W. F. Libby, Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, expressing the view that there would never be a time when power development by atomic energy would completely replace power developed by conventional powerplants. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1955.
Hon. FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior,
United States Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AANDAHL: This has reference to your letter of February 17 wherein you ask for an expression from the Atomic Energy Commission as to how soon we estimate that the goal of producing electrical energy, utilizing atomic energy, might be competitive in costs to other fuels; also our views as to the time period which might be involved before electric energy could be produced directly from atomic energy; and whether or not we feel that hydroelectric, or even conventional, fuel plants will soon become obsolete.

Generation of electricity from nuclear fuel should first become competitive with conventional fuels in areas of high cost electricity. We feel this could happen during the 1960's. However, regardless of this fact, it is our feeling that hydroelectric plants which can be economically justified at this time probably will not become obsolete during their useful life.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

ECHO PARK DAM NOT AN INVASION OF
DINOSAUR MONUMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Echo Park Dam has been the object of considerable and often loose and inaccurate discussion. It has been urged by some conservationists that the dam is an invasion of a national monument, and that it will lead to the destruction of the National Park System. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955, my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. WATKINS] completely refuted this contention, and demonstrated that the Dinosaur Monument expansion in 1938 was itself an invasion of valid reclamation and power withdrawals dating back to 1904.

It was only after repeated assurances from the Federal Government that the reclamation and power withdrawals would be honored, that the people of Utah and Colorado consented to the expansion of the monument from 80 acres to 209,000 acres in 1938. Mr. David H. Madsen conducted the meetings for the Federal Government in Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., in 1936, which secured local approval. I ask unanimous consent that a sworn statement by Mr. Madsen concerning these meetings be put in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with five affidavits of men who attended the meetings.

There being no objection, the statement and affidavits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT, TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, IN THE MATTER OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT, ECHO PARK, AND SPLIT MOUNTAIN DAMS, APRIL 3, 1950

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

David H. Madsen, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says: That he is over the age of 21 years and a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Utah County, Utah.

That at the time the area of the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the canyon unit I was employed by the national park service under the title of supervisor of wild life resources for the national parks. Among my other duties I was acting superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument and in that capacity was ordered by the national park service to arrange for hearings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., for the purpose of securing the approval of the citizens of that area for the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument to include the canyon unit. Meetings were accordingly held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936, and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936. A large representation of the citizens of the area were present at these two meetings.

Among other questions which arose was the question of grazing and the question of power and/or irrigation development which might be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future time. I was authorized to state, and did state as a representative of the national park service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development.

The first part of this agreement with reference to grazing has been carried out and the residents of the area involved are entitled to the same consideration with reference to the development of power and irrigation at the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, and any other development that may not unduly interfere for the purpose of the establishment of the monument and which is necessary for the proper development of the area.

DAVID H. MADSEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March A. D. 1950.

KARL H. BENNETT,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

Leo Calder, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah;

That he attended a meeting called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at this meeting, and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stepotype machine;

That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of the future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

LEO CALDER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

Joseph Haslam, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Jensen, Uintah County, State of Utah, for the past 35 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meetings was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

JOSEPH HARLEM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

B. H. Stringham, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah, for the past 40 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

B. H. STRINGHAM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

H. E. Seeley, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah, for 30 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meetings was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

H. E. SEELEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL]

RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,

County of Uintah, ss:

J. A. Cheney, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah;

That he attended a meeting called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at this meeting and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

J. A. CHENEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1950.

[SEAL]

RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have prepared additional material, which includes quotations from newspaper reports of the period, setting forth very clearly the impressions which the people of Utah gained from those promises. I ask unanimous consent to have that material printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Madsen states that "I was authorized to state and did state, as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

Quite clearly, future power and irrigation projects were contemplated and the people of the area were promised that they would not be jeopardized by the monument expansion. Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes states in a policy directive governing the negotiations to create the Dinosaur National Monument that "The future development of mineral, water, and power resources, if and when it should become economically feasible, would be determined by the Congress."

The promises made were an outgrowth of concern expressed by local people, including Governor Blood, of Utah, who wrote Senator King, of Utah, requesting that reservations

for the development of power, water, and minerals in the proposed monument be made. In May of 1938, Congressman Taylor and Senator Johnson of Colorado were notified by the Park Service that the Secretary of the Interior had approved the enlargement, subject to the reclamation and power withdrawals.

In response to a request from Secretary Ickes on June 6, 1935, asking that the Federal Power Commission release its power withdrawals in the affected area, Chairman Frank R. McNinch replied, "The Federal Power Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource in the proposed monument area is too great to permit voluntary relinquishment, but the Commission will not object to the creation of a monument if the proclamation setting aside the area contains a specific provision that the development will be permitted."

EXECUTIVE ORDER ALLOWS DAMS IN MONUMENT

As a result of these negotiations and promises, President Roosevelt provided in his 1938 Executive order expanding the monument that "the Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument * * * except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * * as amended and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." Significantly, the power reservations cover the Echo Park dam site as well as that of Split Mountain.

UTAH RELIED ON FEDERAL PROMISES

The Utah papers carried a series of stories on the President's proclamation. The Vernal Express for July 21, 1938, stated: "In bringing the 318 square miles into the national monument, which heretofore covered only 80 acres, the Park Service agreed to permit the Division of Grazing to continue operation on the land and recognized power and reclamation rights."

The Salt Lake Tribune dated July 29, 1930, in a front-page article entitled "United States Enlarges Dinosaur Area in Utah" chronicled the following: "Under the order enlarging the monument, grazing will continue in areas which previously have been used by stockmen, and power and irrigation rights will be recognized."

The Vernal Express carried two further articles, the first on July 28, 1938, saying, "J. A. Cheney, cashier of the Uintah State Bank, has worked on the enlargement and the development of the Dinosaur National Monument for a number of years, representing the Vernal Lions. It was through the efforts of Mr. Cheney that the power and grazing rights were protected in the opening of the new scenic region." Then, on August 4, 1938, the Express said: "Under the order enlarging the monument, grazing will continue in areas which previously have been used by stockmen, and power and irrigation rights will be recognized."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the people of Utah bargained with the Federal Government in good faith, and took the promises of its agents and the Executive order of President Roosevelt to be reliable. It is only natural, therefore, that we are nonplussed to discover that some misguided national conservationist leaders charge that the Echo Park Dam is an invasion. They have spent many thousands of dollars attacking the Echo Dam, saying that it would destroy the national park system. They could have used their money to aid the park system and build it up. Instead, they have chosen the weakest link in the monu-

ment system upon which to base a highly emotional stand, the only monument containing both power and reclamation withdrawals far antedating the creation of the monument.

The Echo Park Dam is patently not a precedent or an invasion to destroy national parks. Therefore, it should be judged on its merits. It is the second most efficient dam in the project in terms of storage, conserving water, and power production. It has a low rate of evaporation loss, so important in the arid West. Compared to feasible alternates, the Echo Park Dam will save 120,000 acre-feet of water annually in evaporation losses, enough to supply a city with a population over 400,000. The total population of the State of Utah is only 750,000. It is strategically located for the potential power market, located between Denver and Salt Lake City. Further, it is in the center of other lesser reservoirs, improving their efficiency.

Mr. President, in conclusion, the upper Colorado storage project culminates several decades of engineering study designed to put water on the dry lands of the upper basin States and still meet the commitments to the lower basin under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Utah negotiated the 1922 compact with southern California in good faith, so that it could proceed with its development. It is now our turn to develop our half of the water apportioned by the compact. I hope that Congress will recognize the good faith evidenced by Utah and the upper basin in honoring the compact, and that southern California will now show her good faith by also honoring it and allow the upper basin to develop its water.

Similarly, Utah relied on the promises and assurances made by the Federal Government when the Dinosaur Monument was expanded to include the Echo Park Dam site. We were promised by United States officials that the expansion would not preclude later irrigation and power development. I hope that the Congress will not countenance the proposal that the United States back out of its agreements with the people of Utah and Colorado.

We in Utah are in dire need of the water, which is rightfully ours, from the Colorado River. Our entire future is dependent on obtaining more water for our agricultural, municipal, and industrial expansion. I think that our water turn is long overdue, and I am confident that this body will recognize the wisdom and value of the project to the entire Nation as well as to Utah and the upper basin.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the upper Colorado River storage projects.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Before discussing the many and varied merits of the upper Colorado River storage projects, I want first to thank and congratulate the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for its

full and complete hearings on this bill, S. 500. I was especially impressed with the vast and detailed knowledge of the subcommittee's chairman on every facet of the interstate compacts governing the use of water flowing in this great artery, the Colorado River. I would be pleased for the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, to accept my compliments.

The bill, S. 500, was sponsored by Mr. ANDERSON and nine other Senators through whose States the mighty Colorado courses. All members of the Senate are familiar and acquainted with the huge dams built in the canyons of this river to generate electricity, the tremendous man-made lakes which serve as storage for irrigation and reclamation of barren but highly productive lands once they are touched by water. In this respect, the complete report on S. 500 speaks for itself.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain six specified initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works.

After reexamination of the economic justification of each participating project including a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, such participating projects will be constructed as economic conditions permit. It would declare the intent of the Congress to authorize additional units of the Colorado River Storage Project and additional participating projects. It also would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, construct, operate, and maintain public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for Colorado River storage project units and participating projects.

It is also very interesting to note on page 279 of the hearings the testimony of Hon. Val Peterson, administrator of the Civil Defense Administration. He said, in part, while endorsing this bill:

"My interest today is in the features of the project that lend themselves to the survival of the United States in time of war. I am, of course, familiar with the President's desire that the development go forward in the national interest.

"In this nuclear age, if an attack is made on the United States, it will be necessary, first, to get our people away from our critical target areas, our great centers of population and industry, and if a city is hit by a hydrogen bomb, we will not be able to re-enter for some time, and possibly never.

"Second, the time is here for us to think about constructing or developing locations where vital or sensitive industries and facilities will be more secure.

"I will call your attention to the work that Russia is reported to have done in developing a second line of industry behind the Ural Mountains.

"Too, I have had the privilege of visiting many of the underground defense plants and military installations in Scandinavia. I refer to such installations as the great Bofors Armament Works, to the SKF plant, as well as to air hangars and destroyer bases created in the rock.

"While I am not proposing that our industries as such be relocated, I do urge that in expanding and extending our industries we should look to areas where they would be more difficult to attack.

"The upper Colorado development by providing water and power would pave the way for taking care of those who, by necessity, may be forced to evacuate our west coast cities."

In discussing the upper Colorado River storage project, it is well to remember two facts about the general region it affects: First, the area is subject to erratic and unpredictable periods of drought and floods,

and second, it is undergoing a period of rapid industrialization and accelerated development of natural resources.

These two facts help explain some of the most urgent needs for the construction of the project. Foremost is the need to store water so that the excess water during years of plentiful flow can be saved for use during years of low flow. The future economy of Colorado and four other Western States is dependent on the conservation and use of its available water resources.

This project is also vitally needed to supply municipalities and for industrial growth. In fact, present demand for municipal water in the project area is increasing rapidly. I think it should be made clear that the proposed upper basin development is the last of the water resources available in many parts of the area to supply additional water for municipal and industrial purposes.

Not only is there a great need for water. There is also a tremendously increasing demand for electric energy. The power demands of the region are expected to exceed the output of all the power installations now scheduled, including those of the Colorado River project, for years to come. So the generation of hydroelectric energy by the project should be considered an important contribution to the future of the region and of the United States.

Still another contribution of the project should be mentioned. At present, the Colorado River system is committing larceny on a grand scale. I am told that it annually carries away more than 131 million tons of good soil—enough to build a 4- by 5-foot wall around the earth at the equator. This soil is deposited for the most part in Lake Mead, where it is being piled to heights threatening the useful life of the lake. The silt retention benefits of the project will greatly minimize the deposit and the attrition upon the benefits of the Hoover Dam.

At this time, I want to clarify a misconception about this bill which opponents are prone to amplify. The opponents' lobbyist who would want all water in the Colorado River for unrestricted use in their particular State and the misinformed conservation and wildlife groups contend that the Echo Park project would be an invasion of a national park and would set a precedent which would endanger our national-park system. These opponents are confused people; they are well-meaning people who have been lead astray because they are not fully informed of the facts.

This issue has been debated on this Senate floor before. The most accurate record and explanation of facts was given by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, on March 28. He attempted to clear away some misconceptions by explaining the words "Echo Park" are themselves misleading.

In the West it has long been a custom to designate an open area or a valley, canyon, and similar spots as parks. These small areas are found along streams and rivers flowing through our great forests. To my knowledge there is North Park, South Park, East Park, and West Park, to name just a few. Only through misconception and usage of the word park, have people come to think of them as being national parks.

It is through this practice of naming such areas has the mistaken belief arisen among people that "Echo Park" is really a national park.

In order to set the record straight so that all may understand, I want to explain the circumstances and review developments chronologically regarding the origin of Echo Park.

As the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] explained, in 1915 President Woodrow Wilson under the Antiquities Act set aside an 80-acre tract of land in northeastern Utah, where some skeletons of dinosaurs had been

discovered, as a national monument. This area was called Dinosaur National Monument, and that monument probably has received more publicity in the past few years than any other monument in the United States.

This 80-acre tract was a part of the public domain. Later, on July 14, 1938—to be exact—President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by formal proclamation, added 203,885 acres of public land, which included parts of northwestern Colorado, to the original 80 acres and declared it, subject to some significant exemptions, to be a part of the Dinosaur National Monument.

The new area extends roughly 40 miles upstream on the Colorado River tributaries. The monument extension embraced lands on both sides of the Green and Yampa Rivers, and the area named "Echo Park" by the pioneers is included within its boundaries.

The opponents of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams contend that this 1938 proclamation made all the area along those streams, including the Echo and Split Mountain Dam sites, a part of a national monument, and they challenge not only the propriety but also the legal right of public use of these reservoir and dam sites for water, power, and reclamation purposes.

This claim is challenged by the sponsors of the Colorado River because documentary evidence shows conclusively that a tremendous acreage within the present monument boundaries was reserved for water and power development from 13 to 34 years before the extension of Dinosaur Monument in 1938.

These facts which I have just related are based on the documentary evidence from the files of the Department of Interior and the Federal Power Commission. The conclusions stated here have not been refuted in the 734 pages of hearings on this bill. The majority of the Interior Committee, composed of Senators from all sections of the country, after hearing testimony on both sides of the question, voted that there is no invasion of national parks or monument areas in the construction of Echo Park Dam.

These, in brief, are some of the more important reasons why we, in Congress, should vote the passage of this legislation. It must be borne in mind by the Nation at large that the developments of these benefits cannot be made available for our use in a few months. This project will not be completed until the next century—after the year 2,000, if we are to plan and develop our Nation's resources for the foreseeable future, they must be commenced now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles on the Colorado River storage project, published in the Denver Post on March 2 and 5, entitled, respectively, "Upper River Called Defense Bastion" and "Water Hogging Try Hit."

The articles were written by Mr. Barnett Nover, chief of the Denver Post Washington bureau and a writer of wide experience and reputation, who has done outstanding work in covering the progress of the Colorado River storage legislation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of March 2, 1955]
UPPER RIVER CALLED DEFENSE BASTION—CD
CHIEF TELLS OF WAR NEEDS

(By Barnett Nover)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The upper Colorado River basin area could be a defense stronghold in event of war, Val Peterson,

Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration told a Senate subcommittee Wednesday.

The subcommittee is holding hearings on a bill authorizing the billion-dollar river storage project.

In response to a query by Senator WATKINS (Republican), of Utah, a member of the subcommittee, Peterson said he was voicing not only his own view but that of the Eisenhower administration, which has strongly endorsed the storage project.

CITES NORWAY, SWEDEN

Peterson said the mountainous region served by the upper Colorado was peculiarly suited to participate in a dispersal program.

He pointed out that such dispersal to mountain hideaways already is being carried out in Norway and Sweden where such installations as the great Bofors armaments works and the SKF ball-bearing plant have been built underground.

"The time is here for us to think about constructing or developing locations where vital or sensitive industries and facilities will be more secure," Peterson said.

IDEALLY SUITED AREA

"The upper Colorado development, by providing water and power would pave the way for taking care of those who by necessity may be forced to evacuate our west coast cities. It would be fortunate if we had areas, with adequate water and power facilities, far removed from our vulnerable and heavily populated urban centers to which these people (those forced to evacuate from west coast areas) could go. The area in the upper Colorado Basin would be ideally suited for such development.

The civil defense administration chief cited the fact that the Nation's expanding economy requires new sites for industry.

"If uranium is a coming source of power," Peterson said, "it might be profitable for industry to locate near its source. If the oil shale developments prove out, new industries should be located near the source of this fuel. The entire basin has great coal reserves as well as other minerals and raw materials. Water and power will be sorely needed for such developments."

Citing a report on industrial concentration in the United States made by a group of universities for the Government, Peterson said that of the 96 million urban residents in the United States, 33 million live in the central cities of our 32 largest metropolitan areas which together occupy an area equivalent to a square only 55 miles to a side.

[From the Denver Post of March 5, 1955]
WATER HOGGING TRY HIT—UPPER STATE AIDES
BLAST CALIFORNIAN
(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Senators from the upper Colorado Basin, after listening to opposition voiced by representatives of southern California to the storage project vehemently denounced the Pacific-coast State for trying to hog all Colorado River water for its own purposes.

"I haven't the slightest doubt," Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN said, "that the representatives of California are sincere in their desire to get all the Colorado River water, although that State does not contribute one drop.

"It's been their course of action from the beginning."

Supporting this view, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, told a witness appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, now in its fifth day of hearings, that the fundamental issue is whether California "gets all the water or whether the upper basin States get a spoonful from time to time."

Similar views were expressed by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyo-

oming, and Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah.

RIGHT TO VIEWS

The California witnesses were defended by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California. He said that they had a right to state their views and "ought to be run out of town" if they failed to speak up.

ANDERSON is chairman of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee which is looking into the storage plan whose purpose is to enable the upper basin States to put to beneficial use the share of Colorado River water to which they are entitled under the compact of 1922.

Earlier, Ben P. Griffith, president, board of water and power commissioners, city of Los Angeles, like the other witnesses from southern California, had expressed strong opposition to the bill authorizing the upper Colorado storage project.

Griffith contended, as previous California witnesses had before him, that the bill "constitutes a reinterpretation of the Colorado River compact which is indefensible," since he alleged it would nullify contracts entered into by Los Angeles with the Government for the purchase of power from the Hoover Dam.

CITES HOOVER REPORT

Griffith also argued that in any case the report of the Hoover Commission task force on reclamation and water, which is headed by former Gov. A. L. Miller, of Wyoming, should be awaited before any action is taken on the bill.

This led Anderson to say:

"We couldn't put our case before a more unfriendly jury than the Hoover Commission task force on water."

He cited the fact that Miller already was on record as hostile to the storage plan and other large-scale multiple-use irrigation, reclamation, and power projects.

Another argument made by Griffith and repeated by other California witnesses at the hearing, as well as by Senator KUCHEL, was that since there was such a sharp divergence in the interpretations of the Colorado compact by California and the other signatories, the upper basin States should agree to join in the Arizona-California suit now before the Supreme Court. This the upper basin States have resisted.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

RETIREMENT OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the recent retirement of Prime Minister Winston Churchill ended the public career of one of the greatest men in history. We Texans have a deep appreciation for his tremendous contribution to the cause of freedom in the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 203

Whereas on April 5, 1955, one of the great men of our time, the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire, retired from a lifelong career of active public service; and

Whereas the cloth from which men of the caliber of Churchill is cut is seldom loomed, as expressed in the immortal prose of another Englishman of 3 centuries ago, Shakespeare—

"He was a man, take him for all in all, We shall not look upon his like again"; and

Whereas the empire of Texas, mother of many patriots herself, wishes to congratulate the British Empire for her good fortune in having had available the services of this patriot; and

Whereas the empire of Texas wishes to pay tribute and honor to Winston Churchill for his superb leadership and innumerable contributions to the freedom-loving people of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we here and now pay our respects to a beloved world citizen, Winston Churchill, and congratulate the British Empire upon the outstanding services which it has received; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread on the pages of the senate journal, and that copies be forwarded to the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill and to the British Museum with the request that it be suitably displayed.

(Lock, Hardeman, Phillips, Ashley, Weinert, Aikin, Bracewell, Colson, Corbin, Fly, Fuller, Hazlewood, Kazen, Kelcey, Lane, Latimer, Martin, McDonald, Moffett, Moore, Owen, Parkhouse, Ratliff, Roberts, Rogers of Childress, Rogers of Travis, Secrest, Shireman, Strauss, Wagonseller, Willis, Ramsey, Lieutenant Governor.)

BEN RAMSEY,

President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on April 6, 1955.

[SEAL]

LOYCE M. BELL,

Secretary of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Jesse T. Smathers to be postmaster at Canton in the State of North Carolina.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 21, 1955
For actions of April 20, 1955
84th-1st, No. 65

CONTENTS

Achievement award.....23	Experiment stations.....28	Organization, executive...29
A.C.P.....10	Farm relief.....11,31	Personnel.....17,23
Acreage allotments...10,11	Flood control.....33	Price supports.....19
Agricultural	Foreign aid.....2,22,34,36	Reclamation.....3,33,37
appropriations.....16	Forestry.....7,20,32	Rice.....6,36
Agricultural Stabilization	Lands, transfer.....12	Soil conservation.....10,22
Committee.....14,18	Legislative program.....16	Sugar.....35
Appropriations.....1,15,16	Livestock loans.....8	Tobacco.....13
Dairy industry.....30	Loans, farm.....8,21,25	Trade agreements.....5,16
Disaster relief.....11,31	Loyalty Day.....4	Water conservation.....22,26
Education.....23	Marketing.....24,27	Wheat.....24
Electrification, rural	Monopolies.....19	Wind erosion control.....1
.....9,15,22,30	Natural resources.....22	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses received President's foreign aid message. Senate passed Colorado reclamation bill. Senate committee reported bills to: amend rice-quota provisions, authorize sale of forest tracts, continue livestock-loans program, repeal REA State formula, repeal tie-in of ACP with acreage allotments, provide additional acreage allotments for freeze areas, etc. Senate committee ordered reported measure directing USDA to study burley tobacco problem. House passed postal pay raise bill. Rep. Moulder urged investigation of Mo. Agricultural Stabilization Committee's methods. Sens. Carlson and Morse introduced and discussed bills to provide two-price wheat plan. Sens. Johnston and Thurmond introduced, and Sen. Thurmond discussed, bills to limit interest on certain farm loans to 3%. Rep. Gathings commended Secretary's handling of Japanese rice negotiations.

SENATE

1. **SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 4903, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 4079-80, 4082-4). The House concurred in the Senate amendment regarding the wind erosion control item. For other items of interest to this Department, see Digest 64. This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. **FOREIGN AID.** Both Houses received the President's message recommending continuation of the Mutual Security Program under an International Cooperation Administration in the State Department; to Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee (H. Doc. 144)(pp. 4080, 4084-6).
3. **RECLAMATION.** Passed, 58-23, with amendments S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project (pp. 4048-73).
4. **LOYALTY DAY.** Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 184, to designate May 1, 1955,

as Loyalty Day (p. 4073). This measure will now be sent to the President.

5. TRADE AGREEMENTS. The Finance Committee made additional tentative decisions regarding various provisions of H. R. 1, the trade agreements bill (p. D311).
6. RICE QUOTAS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2839 (S. Rept. 213) and H. R. 4356 (S. Rept. 214), and with amendments H. R. 4647 (S. Rept. 211), to amend various provisions of the rice marketing quota laws (p. 4031).
7. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 1079, to authorize sale of isolated or protruding tracts of national forest land (S. Rept. 207)(p. 4031).
8. LIVESTOCK LOANS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1372, to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen (S. Rept. 208)(p. 4031).
9. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act so as to eliminate the requirement that not more than 10% of the loans may be made in any one State (S. Rept. 209)(p. 4031).
10. SOIL CONSERVATION; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1573, to repeal the requirement that farmers must comply with acreage allotments on basic crops in order to be eligible for ACP payments (S. Rept. 210).
11. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; FARM RELIEF. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 1628, to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes (S. Rept. 206)(p. 4031).
12. LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 998, to authorize conveyance of a tract of ARS land to Woodward, Okla. (S. Rept. 212)(p. 4031).
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported H. J. Res. 107, to permit Federal release of reversionary rights in certain former FHA land located at Kern County, Calif. (p. D310).
13. TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported S. J. Res. 60, directing the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study and report regarding burley tobacco marketing controls (p. D310).
14. AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION COMMITTEE. Received a Mo. State legislature resolution requesting the USDA to investigate the activities of the Mo. State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen, the suspension of the William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers, etc. (pp. 4029-30).
15. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger spoke in favor of increased appropriations for the John Day Dam, Columbia River, and inserted an Oregonian editorial on this subject (p. 4080).

According to the Washington Post and Times Herald:

"Such a bomb, if exploded over Norfolk, for example, could shower enough fallout particles to:

"Kill all the unprotected persons living as far north as the southwest edge of Washington.

"Kill half the unprotected persons living between Washington and the outskirts of Baltimore.

"Kill 5 or 10 percent of the unprotected living between Baltimore and the Maryland-Pennsylvania line.

"Allow the residents of Harrisburg, Pa.—more than 220 miles away from Norfolk—the dubious privilege of being left alive to gaze at the holocaust within the deadly fallout ellipse.

"The projections, drawn from figures in the report, are extremes, based on the assumption that the inhabitants remained fully exposed to the radioactivity over a 36-hour period, taking no shelter or other protective measures. Even simple shelters, Strauss said, greatly reduce the danger from radioactivity."

This belated admission of this new atomic hazard has come long after unofficial analyses had described the newest danger. It is assumed by some that this report was planned to coincide with the start of the new series of atomic tests in Nevada and may have been intended to assure the American people that the Nevada tests represented only a very slight danger. As I understand it, atomic weapons, particularly those in high penetration missiles and "small" bombs, do not produce fallout of any drastic consequence. Presumably these are the type atomic weapons which are being tested in Nevada. The second test of the 1955 series in Nevada, a small nuclear device—the probable prototype—exploded on February 22 with a force that jarred cities 135 miles away. The predawn flash was seen 400 miles away, according to the February 23 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The device tested on the Yucca Flats is said to have been one of the smaller weapons. The shot rattled windows in Las Vegas, 75 miles away, and jolted St. George, Utah, 135 miles eastward. It gave the Congressmen, AEC scientists, and 200 military observers a sharp jolt or two, depending on where they were standing. Wind and atmospheric conditions were such that the rumble of the blast was heard in Bishop, Calif., about 140 airline miles west, but skipped the Charleston range where many observers were watching the tests.

The orange flashways reported to have lit up the morning sky in Los Angeles, about 250 miles away, and was visible in Sacramento, Calif., and the San Francisco Bay area, 400 miles distant.

The biggest blast of the new atomic test series on March 7, this year, flashed forks of light visible in a dozen States including Montana, caused an earth rumble 360 miles away, and sent scientists and soldiers scurrying for safety from the Nevada test site. The predawn flash of a nuclear device believed to be at least $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the strength of the standard A-bomb was seen in the Black Hills of South Dakota, more than 800 miles northeast, south of the border in Mexico, and in all 11 Western States. The fireball lasted 20 seconds, according to the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Incidentally, in statements to the press, two Colorado University professors said that fallout from the Nevada tests can no longer be ignored by persons concerned with public health and safety. Dr. Ray R. Lanier and Dr. Theodore Puck were not suggesting that necessary nuclear tests be discontinued but stressed the importance of continued study of the effects of these experiments on the human race.

I recognize the necessity and value of tests and experiments, but at the same time it is difficult to reconcile this with the possibility of miscalculation and the number of hydrogen and atomic bomb explosions that it will take to make the atmosphere radioactive, if there is any basis to the numerous fears of some of the world's greatest scientists. In addition to the remarks of scientists and statesmen that I have already cited, a statement made by Dr. Edgar D. Adrian has been brought to my attention. He is quoted as saying last fall, "We must face the possibility that repeated atomic explosions will lead to a degree of general radioactivity, which no one can tolerate or escape." Adrian, president of the Royal Society, is a former Nobel prize winner and serves officially as the master of Trinity College, Cambridge University in England.

President Eisenhower and Chairman Strauss have answered the question: Should we continue to test hydrogen weapons? Their answer was yes. There is a great element of risk in this decision, but at the same time it is the only answer at the moment, for it might very well be disastrous if the Soviet Union was allowed to gain an advantage over us.

There are those who feel that continued atomic and hydrogen bomb tests are a crime against humanity and will only intensify the jeopardy to the human race. Others feel the program should be expanded and accelerated in this race with the Soviet Union. Few will argue against forging ahead in the nuclear sciences, but relying on the hydrogen bomb as our principal offensive weapon is something else again. It is definitely a deterrent—but complete reliance on such a suicidal weapon may lead to self-destruction.

The latest move along this dangerous path is the new doctrine of "limited" atomic war with tactical weapons, recently expounded by Secretary of State Dulles, with the endorsement of President Eisenhower. This new doctrine has merit in time of war when considering our present nuclear power superiority when faced with the Communist advantage in ground forces. But this argument seems to be rather shortsighted.

Tactical atomic weapons used on military targets only is a wishful attempt at minimizing the dangers of nuclear warfare. Can we rely entirely on this increased precision and accuracy? We must not overlook the unpredictable changes in weather, human error, and mechanical failures. Military targets, particularly airfields, are usually near towns and cities. A weapon large enough to insure the destruction of such targets will almost inevitably take a toll of nonmilitary areas. To completely paralyze an enemy it would be necessary to hit the cities, the centers of industry. The nuclear bombardment of cities might well turn war into suicide. I find very little assurance in the possibility of limiting an atomic war once it was started.

It is not my intention at this time to discuss the merits and demerits of the present military and defense program in general. An excerpt from an address by Sir Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on March 1, 1955, at this point might be very timely. He said:

"The hydrogen bomb has made an astounding incursion into the structure of our lives and thoughts. Its impact is prodigious and profound, but I do not agree with those who say, 'Let us sweep away forthwith all our existing defense services and concentrate our energy and resources on nuclear weapons and their immediate ancillaries.' The policy of the deterrent cannot rest on nuclear weapons alone. We must, together with our NATO allies, maintain the defensive shield in Western Europe."

We do not have the answers to substantiate or discredit the fears about continued hydrogen tests, or if answers do exist, they are kept under a tight lid of secrecy. Until such time as we know of these things, we should not for one moment forget the earth-shattering and destructive power that we are placing so much confidence in.

The working paper before the United Nations sponsored by the United States proposes the establishment of a United Nations disarmament and atomic energy development authority composed of the members of the Security Council and Canada. The objectives in establishing this authority were:

1. To provide international control of atomic energy so as to enforce compliance with the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and insure that nuclear materials are used for peaceful purposes.

2. To supervise programs for limitation and balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, and prohibition and elimination of major mass destruction weapons.

3. To supervise the various safeguards necessary to enforce a disarmament program, including disclosure and verification.

4. To assure each participant that the other states are observing the various agreements.

It is the opinion of many that such a disarmament program as this is somewhat of a lost cause in many respects. The Soviet Union has placed many obstacles in the course of any plan which would meet the approval of the western world. The most recent was the new Soviet demand, made public almost on the eve of the latest London negotiations, for a preliminary "freeze" on armed forces and armaments as of last January 1. Such a freeze would prevent the armament of Japan and, more particularly, West Germany. This is unacceptable to both the United States and Great Britain. At this point it is very unlikely that any system of inspection can be arranged to meet the approval of all nations concerned.

In recent months a great deal of interest has been rallied around a proposal to seek an international moratorium on experimental detonations of hydrogen bombs.

Such a moratorium was suggested last fall by David R. Inglis, of the Argonne National Laboratory, and proposed informally to the President and the Secretary of State by Pierre Mendes-France during his Premiership. It also has the backing of the Asian Prime Ministers who met at the Colombo plan conference in Jakarta last December, though they suggested it not only because they thought it would be a substitute for disarmament but because so many of them do not like the nearness of the Pacific proving grounds.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, on February 11, 1955, suggested in its editorial columns five significant advantages of such a proposal. They are briefly: (a) The plan would be a step, even though a small step, away from war; (b) the ban would be self-enforcing, no elaborate enforcing machinery; (c) it would tend to curb the development of new nuclear devices; (d) the ban would relieve fears about the further accumulation of radioactivity in the atmosphere; (e) a careful proposal would help convince the world of the sincerity of this country's efforts to reverse the drift toward war.

Before I conclude I wish to make note of a proposal sponsored by the Federation of American Scientists which would establish a United Nations commission to study the effects of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. The 2,000-member federation suggests that the U. N. commission examine the extent of radioactive contamination as the result of

past tests, evaluate the potential genetic effects on human beings of future tests and attempt to establish a "danger threshold." This proposal is more or less a modification of the plan I have just discussed.

If the United States were to initiate a program along these lines, it would undoubtedly have a great effect in quieting many fears.

It is difficult to understand how a great nation, such as ours, which has shown such genius in the fields of science and nuclear warfare and, at the same time, has had such poor success in charting a path away from the destruction brought on by these discoveries. Need we advance beyond the point of no return?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce, after consultation with the minority leader, that when action on the unfinished business is concluded, it is my plan to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 651, to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended. That bill, which is Calendar No. 127, provides for permanent certificates for local air-service carriers.

It is planned to have a call of the calendar on Monday; and at that time, I shall have a further announcement to make.

We hope we shall be able to take up the agricultural appropriation bill after we have disposed of the calendar.

We also have on the calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 58, to designate the 1st day of May, 1955, as Loyalty Day. As soon as the author of the joint resolution can obtain the floor, I expect to ask unanimous consent to have that joint resolution considered by the Senate.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ervin	Mansfield	Young
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CONSERVATION OF THE WATER OF THE COLORADO

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, owing to the fact that a unanimous-consent agreement was reached last evening by which debate has been limited, and that it is possible to speak only now upon amendments offered to the bill, and inasmuch as I was unable to make some remarks which I desired to make upon the bill last night because the unanimous-consent agreement was reached without my knowledge, it becomes necessary for me, in order to be within the parliamentary rules, to offer an amendment. I shall do so, Mr. President, by moving that there be added to the bill a provision repealing a law which was enacted by a recent Congress. I am waiting for a copy of the bill in order that I may submit my amendment in proper order.

Mr. President, I move that there be added at the end of the bill the following new section:

There is hereby repealed the act of July 28, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses, from the Santa Marguerita River, Calif., and other purposes."

Mr. President, that is a pro-forma amendment which I do not wish to debate at the present moment.

I should like however, to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the facts about the Colorado River and the procedure for harnessing its water which

is proposed in the bill (S. 500) recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This is a matter which is far more important than mere dry statistics. This is a matter of homes, a matter of construction, a matter of increasing population, a matter of providing opportunities for men to raise their families and to build communities by conserving the waters of a vast river basin in an area which has been throughout most of the life of the Nation almost completely desert.

At this moment, according to the announcement which was made on yesterday, the President of the United States is preparing a message which will come to the two Houses of Congress with respect to some of the point 4 programs to be carried out in other nations of the world in order to promote economic improvement and peace among the peoples of the world.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of the greatest of these programs initiated under the Foreign Operations Administration is the program for the River Jordan. I refer to it, Mr. President, because the area which will be irrigated when the \$80 million plant has been fully constructed, when the dam has been built and the waters are being distributed, consists of arid land, such as is found in some areas of the United States. That arid land in a far-off country will receive the water of the River Jordan which for centuries has been wasted into the sea, with consequent disastrous effects upon the population of ancient Palestine and the surrounding areas. Water will go to Lebanon; water will go to Israel; water will go to the Transjordan area. This reclamation project authorized by the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, is in conformity with policies which, unlike those having the aspects of war, consisting of equipping of armies, and the making of atomic bombs, have to do with building for the future peace of the world.

The Department of the Interior has loaned 87 different experts of the Bureau of Reclamation to foreign countries with which to construct irrigation works. The countries include India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Colombia, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Formosa, and Australia. Many of those areas are dry and even desert land.

Fortunately for those countries, there are no theorists there who are devoted to the belief that it is better to preserve the ancient ruins of centuries gone than it is to use the scientific capacity of modern man to build modern engineering works in order to conserve and use the water which has been wasted for thousands of years.

Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that the Senate today has the great pleasure of having as auditors in the Chamber some members of the German Bundestag. Inasmuch as

they, like the Members of the Senate, especially the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, are vitally interested in taking steps designed to promote peace and culture among mankind, I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of permitting him to introduce these gentlemen. I hope that the time to be taken for this greeting will not be charged to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be used for this purpose be not charged to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not take the time to introduce these gentlemen individually; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very short biographical sketch of each of them, in order that Senators may know something about each of the gentlemen who are honoring us with their presence today.

There being no objection, the biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Richard Jaeger, Christian Social Union, vice president of the Bundestag, chairman of the Committee for European Security. Born February 16, 1913, in Munich. Studied law at Munich, Berlin, and Bonn, and was admitted to the bar in 1940. Entered the Bavarian government as an official of the ministry of culture in 1947 and became Lord Mayor Eichstaett in 1949. He was elected to the Bundestag on August 14, 1949, and has been vice president since September 7, 1953.

Mr. Fritz Erier, Social Democratic Party, vice chairman of the Committee for European Security. Born in Berlin on July 14, 1913. Active in Berlin city government until 1938. Later director of a chemical plant and an editorial contributor to a law journal.

Became a member of the Socialist Youth Movement in 1928 and was a member of the Socialist underground during entire Nazi period. He was arrested in 1938 and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment the following year. After the war he was county manager (landrat) in Biberach (a position he later held in his adopted hometown of Tuttlingen) and became an official of one of the German provincial governments in 1947. At the same time he became a member of the provincial legislature. He was elected to the Bundestag in August 1949 and has been one of its delegates to the Council of Europe since 1953.

Mr. Hasso von Manteuffel, Free Democratic Party. Born in 1897 in Potsdam. Became a professional officer in 1916 and participated in both World Wars. In World War II he was commander in chief of an armored army and severely wounded on several occasions. Since 1948 he has been active as export manager for a German metallurgical firm. He joined the Free Democratic Party in 1949, where he became chairman of its security committee. He became a Member of the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Ernst Paul, Social Democratic Party. Born in 1897 in Bohemia. He was an early functionary of the Socialist Youth Movement. He worked in the Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia until 1938 when he fled to Sweden in the light of a threatened arrest. Since 1945 he has been editor in chief of the Wuertembergischer Abendzeitung. He was elected to the Bundestag in August

1949 and is an alternate delegate to the Council of Europe.

Mr. Fritz Berendsen, Christian Democratic Party, born in 1904. Officer and businessman. 1923 to 1936 officer, commander of the 2d Cavalry East Prussia War Academy, Berlin. Member of general staff 1938 to 1945 when he reached the rank of colonel. Became a member of a commercial firm Duisburg after his release as prisoner of war. He entered the city council of that city in November 1952 and became chairman of his party's group in the city council in March 1953. He was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Fritz Eschmann, Social Democratic Party. Born in 1909, he was a locksmith in his early years. From 1932 to 1936 he attended police school and became a police official. He was an officer in the German Army from 1936 to 1945. From 1951 to 1952, he was a county manager (Landrat) in Bavaria and was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Dr. Georg Kliesing, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1911. Dr. Kliesing has been a teacher at high schools. He studied at the University of Bonn, where he made his doctorate in modern history in 1932. He served in the German Army as an officer from 1939 to 1945 and spent the years from 1945 to 1949 in the Soviet Union as a prisoner of war. In 1950 he returned to his teaching profession. He was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Johann Peter Josten, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1915. Mr. Josten is a master carpenter, a field in which he has been active since 1929, with the exception of a short period of army service. He became a member of the Catholic Youth Movement in 1929 and after the end of World War II was one of the local founders of the Christian Democratic Party. He was elected to the Rhineland-Palatinate provincial legislature in 1947 and became floor leader for his party in that legislature the same year. Since September 1951, he has been chairman of the Christian Democratic Union's Youth Movement in his state. He was elected to the Bundestag in 1953.

Mr. Josef Stingl, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1919. He attended the University for Political Affairs in Berlin and became a member of a Berlin commercial firm. He was a member of the German Army from 1939 to 1945 and became a member of the executive committee of the Christian Democratic Union in Berlin after World War II. He has been a member of the Bundestag since September 1953.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senate is favored, from time to time, with visits by guests representing legislative bodies of the different countries of the world. We are always happy to see them, to receive them, and to have them stay a while with us in the Senate.

I take great pleasure in presenting to the Senate nine distinguished members of the German Bundestag. I shall ask them to stand and to receive the greetings of the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I hope that as many Senators as may find it possible to do so will take the time to greet and speak to the members of the Bundestag, and to make them feel welcome.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for

5 minutes, in order that the greeting suggested by the Senator from Alabama may take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCOTT in the chair).

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to make clear to the Members of the Senate what the proposed works in the upper Colorado storage basin and particularly the so-called Echo Park Dam will do, I have had brought to the floor of the Senate some pictures depicting the scene before and after the event to show, as I think I can show conclusively, that there will be no damage or danger to the scenery of this area and no injury to wildlife, but only a scientific and engineering triumph which will make useful the water which has been pouring down the Colorado River system for years beyond the memory of man.

I shall ask Mr. Wilson, of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to bring me two of the photographs. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, many of the Members of the Senate are at luncheon, so I speak, as in increasing degrees, due the pressure of congressional business, we must all speak these days, to empty seats.

ECHO PARK IS NOT A NATIONAL PARK

I have before me, Mr. President, photographs of the Echo Dam site, before construction and after construction. Here can be seen the scenery as it now exists, and as those who wish to strike Echo Dam from this project wish it to remain. Here is shown the same canyon with the dam as it will look when constructed. Nothing is taken from the beauty of the scene. The dam is planned to be 502 feet high. It stands in a canyon which is probably 3,000 feet deep. Can anyone who has ever visited this area say with any truth and justice that the building of that dam will ruin this scenery? Let it be remembered that Echo Park is a local name. It is not and never was a national park.

The dam was sketched on the photograph of this canyon by draftsmen, with engineering accuracy. It represents the situation as it will exist.

I now point to two photographs of Steamboat Rock and the Yampa River junction.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has asked me for specific information about this question, and point out to him Steamboat Rock as it

now stands. I point out to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who will speak on this question a little later, when he presents his amendment to strike out the provision for Echo Park Dam, that shown here is the beautiful Steamboat Rock. I point out Steamboat Rock, after the dam is built and the water has been stored. Again, I point out the gateway of the Lodore. I point out the scenery today, and the scenery as it will be after the dam has been constructed. Here again no natural beauty is being destroyed.

Mr. President, it seems to me that no person with an open mind should be misled by the arguments of the conservationists of the canyons of Manhattan Island. Those canyons were manmade. Nobody objected to the engineering triumphs by which the skyscrapers that make those canyons were built, and yet from offices in those skyscrapers are pouring out editorials and propaganda by men who never visited this area, and who would like to condemn the upper Colorado Basin to be forever a graveyard of the dinosaurs.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will pardon the language, how many dam developments are there to be in this project?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it will depend upon what future Committees on Appropriations may do.

Mr. WILEY. My question is not facetious. It is based on the idea that the desire is to hold the water back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All the dams are subject to the compact between the States. There will be 6 storage reservoirs of which 5 will develop power.

Mr. President, I should now like to call attention to the map which stands at the rear of the Chamber.

It is important to remember that the Colorado River compact was written in 1920, by the authority of Congress. Congress passed the law because at that time Congress was persuaded by the Representatives of the West in Congress and by Herbert Hoover—not then President, of course—that the water which had been pouring down the Colorado River Basin for millions of years should finally be harnessed and put to use. So the area was divided by compact among the affected States into two sections, the lower basin and the upper basin, which was approved later by Congress. It was provided that the States of the upper basin, which included Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, a part of New Mexico, and a part of Arizona, should, every year, deliver to the lower basin 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually, or 75 million acre-feet in the 10-year period.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. My question was based upon the thought that if a great deal of the scenic beauty, or however it may be described, should be obliterated by construction of the project, where is the next lower dam? If it is water that is desired, where is the next lower dam,

and how would that affect the water supply?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has based his question on the premise that the scenic beauty would be obliterated.

Mr. WILEY. No; I meant that it is said by some that it would be. I ask, where is the next lower dam? The proponents of the measure are after water.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are after water, and the desire is to begin to use the water on the upper reaches of the stream, not with the purpose of keeping it from California, but to prevent it from going uselessly into the sea, but in order to accomplish that purpose, it is necessary to build storage reservoirs lower in the river. There is proposed, therefore, the great Glen Canyon storage project, shown here at the bottom of the map. That is a project for storing water. I point to Echo Park and Flaming Gorge near the top of the map. These are storage and power reservoirs. Then there are numerous participating projects throughout the upper basin.

What I wish the Members of the Senate to understand is that whatever may happen, we must and shall deliver 75 million acre-feet every 10 years to the lower basin. The lower basin has already used about 6 million acre-feet of the amount which was allotted to it. We in the upper basin have not yet begun to build large projects like the Hoover Dam. Our use at the upper basin if the bill should be enacted into law, would amount to about 4½ million acre-feet, as I understand. In other words, if the projects were all constructed, we would be able to use only about two-thirds of the water which is ours under the Colorado River compact. We are under the obligation, which is in no wise impaired by any provision of the pending bill, to deliver 75 million acre-feet for the use of the lower basin in every 10-year period.

This is a flowing stream, Mr. President. Every day water goes to waste and will continue to go to waste until we begin to build these works. We are trying to harness these wasting waters in the upper basin so that they will benefit the whole valley of the Colorado.

I can understand, of course, that some of the people of California may be fearful that they may lose something. They will not. Some of them may be guided by the false or unworthy thought that if the construction of the dams in the upper basin can be stopped, since the water must continually flow down hill, that water may be put to use in the lower basin, and claims could be asserted some time in the future which would make it difficult for the upper-basin States to use the water allotted to them in the compact.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I have been looking at the map, off and on, for the past 2 or 3 days, and I am somewhat puzzled by it. There are a great many sites for the application of water on the left-

hand side of the map, and some on the right-hand side. So far as I can judge, the application of the water to the upper basin does not seem to be related to those dams.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Vermont asked that question. The Senator has raised the engineering question of how water is exchanged. What we are proposing to do is to store the water from the very moment the proposed dams are built. When the dams are constructed—and that will be done in such a manner as not to deprive the lower basin of any flow—it will be possible to use upstream the daily run of the river for the projects in the upper basin until it is necessary to release the water to fill the storage basins lower down or to transmit water to the lower basin.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me see whether I correctly understand the situation. Is it true that in order to use the water on the other streams of the Colorado watershed it is necessary to provide water from the dams on the Green River and the Yampa River, to replace water which will be used at the other spots? Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. So that is the project, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the project which will store the water which otherwise would be wasted, water which California cannot use, water which the lower basin cannot use, water which Mexico cannot use—because Mexico also has an interest—and water which otherwise will, therefore, flow into the sea. By means of this project we shall stop that waste; and by stopping it in the storage basins we shall make it possible to use upstream the water which will be flowing down the next day, the next week, the next month, the next year, until we are required to pass on that water, to fill this dam.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, without building those dams, or their equivalent, under the agreement, it will not be possible to carry on the irrigation projects on the east side of the watershed, will it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite correct. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that the present Governor of Colorado, who for many years a distinguished and very much admired Member of the Senate—I refer to Gov. Edwin Johnson, of Colorado—came before the committee to plead the cause of some of the areas in Colorado, among them the city of Denver. Unless this project is built, unless this water is stored, unless it is held back, the city of Denver will not have the water. In that event, the State of Wyoming and its citizens also will simply have to sit on the banks of the stream, twiddling their thumbs, watching the water flow by their doors. They will not be able to use it. That is what the conservationists would have us do.

Mr. FLANDERS. I see that certain Wyoming projects are involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I see on the map the city of Green River.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Vermont sees the city of

Green River. It will be one of the beneficiaries of this project.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have seen it many times.

I think I am reaching a clear understanding of the theory of the proposal. I am still disturbed that the first development lies in the river bottom or the canyon bottom at the Echo Park site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what priority the engineers will give to the construction. Nothing at all in the bill would give Echo Park the first priority.

Mr. FLANDERS. There would seem to be more storage in the Glen Canyon Reservoir site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is, but the Echo Dam site is ideally suited to storage without evaporation.

Mr. FLANDERS. And there would seem to be even as much or more storage in the upstream Yampa site, and there would seem to be as much storage in the Flaming Gorge site. Yet, somehow, the emphasis—by what means I do not know—seems to be laid on the construction of the Echo Park Reservoir site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation is simple. Opponents of this reservoir have diligently cultivated the false impression that this is a national park. It is not a national park. The Echo Park is a local name and not a Federal name. Opponents acknowledge that the Echo Park Dam will not disturb the original Dinosaur National Monument. All this has been set forth, but unfortunately the burdens of the Senate are so great that Senators are detained in committee rooms and are not present.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Wyoming and I are here; that answers that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; we are here.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We shall explain the proposal to ourselves. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used by Senators who ask me questions may be charged to the time available to them, and not to the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, other Senators will have an opportunity to comment, by way of objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, other Senators will have 30 minutes, under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I further correctly understand that the time required for the questions which now are being asked by other Senators will be charged to the time available to the opponents?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, which amendment is under consideration at this moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may state the parliamentary situation, without having the time so required charged to the time available to me for discussion of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senate for giving that consent.

Will the Senator from Vermont please repeat his question?

Mr. FLANDERS. The question is, What amendment is now under consideration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, yesterday afternoon, at a time when only a handful of Senators were upon the floor, it was agreed that there would be a limit upon the time available today for debate, and that each Senator could speak for half an hour on each amendment; and thereafter, after the amendments had been disposed of, 2 hours would be available for debate on the bill, with the time to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

There being no amendment before the Senate, in order to secure time in which to address the Senate on this subject, I had to offer an amendment; and I offered an amendment to repeal the Fallbrook Act, which was enacted at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. But I wish to assure him that the amendment was a pro forma one, for the Fallbrook Act is killing itself so rapidly that the Californians are now beginning to realize it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; if the time so required is not charged to the time available to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. With that understanding, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to have the able Senator from Wyoming give credit to the junior Senator from California for not raising the question of germaneness in connection with the pro forma amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming; but at the same time I wish to suggest that he might have chosen a somewhat different subject-matter for his pro forma amendment, because when he began to mention the name "Santa Marguerita," which I recognize is to many persons, a term of opprobrium, he gave me a little paroxysm of fear. [Laughter.] I hope that if he has a second pro forma amendment to offer, he will consider some other area of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me confess to the Senator from California that I felt sure that if I mentioned Fallbrook or the Santa Marguerita River, the telegraph wires and telephone wires would carry the story to California, and might result in more of the Senator's constituents favoring this bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now return to the Senator from Ver-

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Am I allowed, in putting myself in opposition to a pro forma amendment of which I have no comprehension—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont does not have to. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to allow my time on the other side of the pro forma amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to be expended in asking these questions, if that is parliamen-

May I inquire who is in control of the time on the other side of the pro forma amendment?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senators to whom that authority was given are not present.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair take time out for a moment and have the agreement read, and then we can start over. The clerk will read the agreement.

The unanimous-consent agreement was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some one designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, as I heard the order read—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield any time to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am trying to arrange matters so that the Senator from Wyoming will not have to yield his own time. That is my purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was my request, I will say to the Senator. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, the Senator may have whatever time he desires to use assigned to the opposition to my pro forma amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I heard the unanimous-consent agreement read, it seemed to be that my request should be made of the majority leader, who is not present. He not being present, or represented, my request is made to the acting minority leader [Mr. PAYNE], who is present. I request of the acting minority leader that I be assigned 5 minutes, in the course of which I shall ques-

tion the author of the pro forma amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has no time at this juncture.

Mr. FLANDERS. Who has the time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that I am the acting majority leader, although on the minority side of the Chamber, I understood the Senator from Vermont to address his query to the genial Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] who is occupying the seat of the minority leader. He was endeavoring to find some Senator who was in opposition to the amendment. I find no one, I will say to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], unless he rises and gives his colleague some time.

Mr. KUCHEL. To the contrary—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the explanation of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] been completed, so that the time now is under control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that it has.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I do not know where that leaves us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 5 minutes left of his 30 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, has the other amendment, which was under consideration, been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have offered the new amendment in order that I might have additional time. The Senator from Vermont may take a part of my time to ask me the question he wished to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that a pro forma amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, I still had 3 minutes to go on the first amendment. In order to meet the technical objection of the Parliamentarian, I withdraw the first amendment. I hope the Senator from California will rise.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I will tell the Senator what I was about to do—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the last word of section 1 be stricken.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator speaking in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator will yield to me, I want him to know that I was about to inquire whether I could obtain the 30 minutes which would have been available had the Senator's amendment been germane, so that I might make a gift to him of the 30 minutes, in order that he might have an hour. I enjoy listening to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very gracious, and I acknowledge receipt of the ghostly gift which was thought of but never tendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move to amend the first section by striking out the last word.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is not in order under the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move to strike out the authorization of the Juniper Reservoir. That is a substantial amendment to the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOW WATER IS EXCHANGED (BY STORAGE)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont desires to ask an important question about the exchange of water, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I think I have now clear in my mind the practical means by which water is provided for these specific irrigation projects by means of conserving water in a stream which does not supply them, but which does supply the necessary number of acre-feet—or whatever measure is used—to the lower basin, in that way permitting the withdrawal of more water from the other Colorado tributaries for local use. Apparently that is the theory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the theory.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the means. That is clear in my mind. What is not clear in my mind, and about which I wish to interrogate the Senator from Wyoming, is the reason for concentrating so heavily on the Echo Park Reservoir site.

Both the proponents and the opponents of the bill are directing their fire to this one site. I can understand the feeling of the opponents of the bill, because it is a natural feeling with me also. I believe that the bottom land in some of the western mountain regions affords some of the most beautiful scenery in our country. I have seen many of such places. I have seen them even on such an ill-named stream as the Dirty Devil River in southern Utah. So I understand why people like to visit them and like to camp on them and would regret to see them flooded under 500 feet of water. I understand their point of view.

From the opponents I should like to inquire—to put the question into the vernacular—why pick on the Echo Park Dam? Why not make the first development, at least, at some other site?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Vermont has raised the question. It is a subject which was referred to the engineers. They are the best engineers in the Government. A long time ago, before the Dinosaur National Monument was created by the

Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson, there were reclamation withdrawals and power withdrawals in this area. They are represented on a map which the Senator from Utah brought to the Chamber. That map shows the site of the Echo Dam. It is at the confluence of the Green River and the Yampa River. Because it is at that confluence, it has ideal qualities for a dam and for the storage of water.

The problem before the engineers was that of storing enough water to provide for the amount of water which must be delivered to the lower basin. The Glen Canyon Dam and the Echo Park Dam and the Flaming Gorge Dam were deemed to be the most feasible and most economical sites for the storage of the water. That is stating the problem as simply and as clearly as I can state it. The expert engineers since early in this century have called it an ideal site for a dam. Again I say the site is a park only because local inhabitants have called it a park, as they call every open spot in the mountains.

However, it should also be stated that the Antiquities Act, under which Woodrow Wilson withdrew the Dinosaur Quarry, provided that for the purpose of preserving the historical and scientific landmarks in that area the least possible land area should be withdrawn. He withdrew 80 acres. That area is marked on the map which the Senator from Utah brought into the Chamber. It would not be flooded. Not one inch of stored water would reach it.

However, in 1938, long after the withdrawals on the Yampa, Green, and Colorado Rivers had been made for reclamation and for power purposes, the National Park Service sought to withdraw the beds of these rivers. They did not come to Congress. Only Congress can create a national park. They sought to attain their object by Executive order under the Antiquities Act. There was a long controversy in the bureaus about the Executive order, and when it was finally written the Executive order contained language which was intended to preserve the power rights and other existing rights.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation with respect to this subject. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, why Echo Park has been made the center of attention and why it is being emphasized, I would say the reasons are very simple. The first reason is that the upper basin area must have water. The second reason is that it is important to hold the water when it comes down from the mountains at a time when we cannot use it, until we can use it. Therefore, we must have storage facilities. Storage is second in importance only to the water itself.

It so happens that Glen Canyon is the largest possible site for storing water. Twenty-six million acre-feet of water can be stored there. Echo Park is the next one in importance from the standpoint of storage. Looking at it on the

map, it would seem that there is more land there.

Actually, Echo Park would have deep storage. There is less evaporation there. It is strategically located with respect to the distribution of power. It is also in the center of other reservoirs, such as Flaming Gorge and Juniper. It is necessary to have at least one reservoir which can be used to meet the peak load and to release it. Echo Park is in the center of the group. It has been, from the very first investigations of the Colorado River, considered to be one of the best sites for power and water development. That is the reason why it is second in importance to Glen Canyon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How many dams will there be?

Mr. WATKINS. If I may answer that question, at first there are six. Eventually there will be nine, which will have power possibilities.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is meant by power possibilities?

Mr. WATKINS. First, they will be used for water storage, and, second, for power development.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How much will the power repay?

Mr. WATKINS. All the costs of the power, together with interest. It will also help to repay the cost allocated to irrigation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How long will it take to amortize the cost of the water, as well as of the power, and all other costs chargeable to the project?

Mr. WATKINS. Fifty years, under the plan now proposed; 50 years, plus a 10-year development period for the irrigation end of it, with participating projects. But the projects will be paid out. Farmers will pay out all they can pay, and the power will "pick up the check" for the irrigation allotment. But the cost will be paid in 50 years. Industrial water and irrigation water will be paid for in 50 years, with an additional period of 10 years which is now permitted under existing law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are operating under a time limitation, it becomes very difficult to answer any questions in detail.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the majority leader yield me some time in opposition to the motion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield the floor in a moment. I think there are as many Senators present as we can gather here today until the time for voting comes. The Senator will have time in which to speak.

DEMAND FOR HOMESTEADS

Mr. President, I refer Senators to the report of the committee for the detailed information with respect to the dams. But what I wish to emphasize is that we are dealing with a problem which arises from the demands of the people of the

United States, from veterans of two wars, and from those who wish to settle upon the land. The Bureau of Reclamation has presently before it approximately 90,000 applications from all parts of the United States for settlement on 1,838 units which the Bureau of Reclamation is now in position to offer for settlement. There will have to be a drawing for every one of those units. There are 90,231 persons from all over the country who are seeking opportunity to settle upon the lands. There is fear that the dam, which the pictures show is only 502 feet high, will destroy scenic values created by the floods of a thousand years, and opposition has been raised all over the United States to the construction of these works.

I pointed out that under the program of trying to rehabilitate the peoples of the world and to bring about peace we have loaned to countries of the Middle East 87 of our reclamation engineers who are working upon the deserts which were created in those areas where warring armies destroyed ancient waterworks and people were driven from their homes which subsequently were covered by the sands swept in by wind. So we have a clear record of the demand of the people for projects of this kind.

In the area of these projects, Mr. President, there are minerals of all kinds, including uranium, coal, and oil and gas shale which can be developed. The first Army officer, a lieutenant, sent up the Colorado River to investigate it, on an exploratory trip financed by the War Department, reported to Washington that in his opinion no man ever would be able to make his way up the river. But the trip was made. The Hoover Dam was built. The Imperial Valley and other places in the area have already prospered and new sources of profit and income have been created. Give us the dams we are now requesting, and the water which is now going to waste can be used where it originates. It will result in the starting of new businesses, the establishment of homes, and the building of schools and churches. Why should we be condemned to the desert created by the waters which men before our time were unable to harness for the public good?

So, Mr. President, I hope the pending bill as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be passed.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendments I have offered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, and 66 to the bill, and con-

curred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there are two amendments at the desk which I desire to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 7, beginning with the word "Sec. 2.", it is proposed to strike out the committee amendment, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when this proposed legislation was originally introduced it provided for the construction of 2 storage units and 13 so-called participating units. As it comes to the floor of the Senate by reason of the adoption in the Senate committee of a whole series of amendments, 6 storage units are provided for and 33 participating units are likewise provided for.

Again and again, during the debate on this measure, I have endeavored to point out to the Senate that one after another the projects which are now included in the bill have been found to be feasible by nobody. The amendment which I have offered deals with a section which provides, or purports to provide, for a declaration of intent to authorize more unnamed projects in the future. Let me read the section on congressional intent as it originally appeared in the bill:

SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is the intent of the Con-

gress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof) —

(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, of waters of the upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act and Federal reclamation law.

In the committee, I attempted to argue that one Congress could not bind a subsequent Congress; that it was meaningless for the 84th Congress to attempt to sit in judgment on what the 85th Congress, or any succeeding Congress, might do; and that to that extent the section dealing with legislative intent was irrelevant, was meaningless, and ought to be deleted in its entirety.

The committee did not see fit to eliminate the section, but it did see fit to rewrite it. I now wish to read the present section 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The report of the committee, on page 13, contains the following paragraph:

The committee recognizes that it may be found desirable to authorize additional storage in the upper reaches of the Colorado River and its tributaries above Grand Junction, Colo., and of additional participating projects in the several upper division States (see sec. 2 of the bill); but it recommends deferment of any commitment by the Congress thereto, due to the fact that engineering reports are not complete.

It seems to me that no one will stand on the floor of the Senate and defend section 2 on the basis of an attempt, constitutionally, to bind future Congresses. That would be an indefensible position.

Section 2 attempts to say, by some type of moral suasion, that the bill, ballooned up, as it is, to include presently 33 projects which are called participating projects, and 6 projects which are called storage units, is only a start. Some start, Mr. President.

Again, it seems to me that before any legislation of this nature is passed, there should be, first, a full and exhaustive study made by the Department of the Interior with respect to feasibility on

every proposed project. That is the burden of my argument.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason why some of the projects are not included. It was the intention of the committee, in my opinion, that the projects should be studied by the Department of the Interior or by any other department which was concerned with making the final recommendation.

Mr. KUCHEL. I may tell my good friend from New Mexico that of the 33 participating projects, the great majority have not been found by the Department of the Interior to be feasible, but they are still included in the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as New Mexico is concerned, I cannot see any reason why the project for the Anima-La Plata, a tributary of the San Juan, which eventually flows into the Colorado, should not be a recipient of the benefit of legislation which will take care of the upper basin States.

Is it the intention that merely because it may be desired by some to prevent the construction of certain projects in the future, even if they are reported as being feasible, the water shall go to the lower basin States or to the Republic of Mexico? Would that be doing justice, in the eyes of the Senator from California?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Let me say very frankly to my friend from New Mexico that it seems to me the bill, by a whole series of amendments, has become almost a Christmas tree, if I may say so, and that this section is an attempt to indicate that more projects, in the future, will be approved for the upper basin.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from California that I like the expression "Christmas tree." I have been a Member of the Senate for a long time. I remember when the central valley, in California, Friant Dam, in California, and Shasta Dam, in California, were characterized as Christmas trees. But I did not think they were Christmas trees; I thought those developments were for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the Senator's statement; certainly. I do not desire to make any statements which are critical or caustic. I tell the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I do not wish to indulge in that kind of language.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. In a moment.

Mr. President, that is the burden of my argument. There ought not to be provision for any additional projects. Such a provision serves no useful purpose. It constitutes, indeed, a red flag which I should think some of the proponents of the bill would like to be rid of.

On that basis I offer the amendment and ask that it be adopted.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from California indicated that on more than a majority of the participating projects sought to be authorized by the bill no report had been made as to feasibility, and no report from an engineering standpoint. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 5 of the bill, beginning at the top of line 1, there is contained an exception, which reads:

Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshali, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savary-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress.

My question is, The Senator understands that provision is in the bill; does he not?

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed I do.

Mr. WATKINS. And that it means that every one of the projects which I have mentioned cannot be authorized, and no construction can be started on them, until they have been further considered by the Congress. It means that nothing can be done until final reports are made as to feasibility, and all the engineering details have been gone into carefully. No work can be done until Congress acts again on these same projects. In other words, those projects are not being authorized by the bill. It is true that they have been decided upon as projects which in time may again be brought before the Congress, when the engineering reports have been made and other necessary work which is necessary has been accomplished. So we are not actually seeking to authorize these particular projects by the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. What useful purpose can be served by including the projects in the proposed legislation?

Mr. WATKINS. One useful purpose will be to concentrate the attention of the Bureau of Reclamation on what will have to be done if these projects are to be approved. At several sessions I introduced a bill to authorize the Colorado River project, largely on the theory that there might be available a report from the Department of the Interior. I knew the bill would not pass, but I also knew that by having the bill introduced we would keep the Bureau of Reclamation busy on the subject, because there would be something for it to aim at. In that way the Bureau of Reclamation would know that eventually, if the reports were finally made saying the projects were feasible, and if there was a favorable cost-ratio basis, the projects would then be before Congress. That

was one of the principal objectives we had in mind in including the projects in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. At least that is a novel treatment of the process of legislative authorization of projects.

Again, to comment on the suggested amendment which I have offered and which I have asked the Senate to consider, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that no legal purpose is served by the inclusion of section 2 in the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Probably no legal purpose is served, but a policy is established by having the section in the bill. The provision sets forth that we do not intend in the future to exclude the projects from possible benefit under the program.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator from California that there is a distinct legal purpose and a very practical purpose served. The provision puts the Bureau of Reclamation on notice that as to certain future projects which it may have to consider it should get its reports and other papers ready and do its own preliminary work. How else can an agency be alerted to such contemplated projects unless they are included in proposed legislation? Let me ask the Senator what harm there is in putting the provision in the bill. Why does he want it stricken out?

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me endeavor to answer both questions which the Senator from Colorado has raised. I think he knows the respect in which I hold him both as a Senator and as a lawyer. I think the Senator knows the basis on which I have endeavored to raise the very serious questions which have occurred to citizens of my State who are responsible for continuing the water supply of my State.

On the basis of what I endeavored to discuss day before yesterday, with respect to the Colorado River compact, the differences in interpretation of the compact by the State which I in part represent and the State which the distinguished Senator from Colorado in part represents, I tried to point out that there was a hazard with respect to the continuance of the flow of the waters of the Colorado River to which my State feels she is entitled. A part of the hazard, a part of the fear, comes from the prodigious number of subjects which are encompassed in the bill. Then there is added a section which purports to be a declaration of intent to add more projects in the days to come. I suggest to the Senator that the provision would serve no legal purpose. To that extent it is needless. It constitutes a red flag that should not be in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The supply for future possible participating areas will come from water which has been allocated, by the 1922 and the upper basin compacts, to the upper basin States. So the upper

basin States have, under the language of the law, provisions carrying legal intendments. The language has the effect of doing those things which are necessary to deal with the distribution and consumption of water, so as to get the water which has been allocated. If the bill mentions certain projects, its only purpose is to alert the Bureau of Reclamation that it must consider those proposals and make reports on them. What harm can the provision do to the upper and the lower basins? The provision has a beneficial purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator agree with me that the language of the provision is surplusage from a legal standpoint?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I do not think it is surplusage from a legal standpoint. I think it serves notice on the agency which is charged with the administration of the proposed act to be prepared to submit reports and to get ready for the future.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not a fact that this Congress cannot bind any future Congress?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. That is true of every provision in the bill that goes beyond this immediate Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that the point just made by the Senator from Colorado has some justification from experience in his own State. After all, the State of Colorado contributes more than 70 percent of the water of the Colorado River. By the compact it is entitled to 52 percent of the water allocated to the upper basin States. Under the projects listed in the bill, Colorado will get only a small fraction of the water, maybe as little as 15 percent. Colorado has a right to look forward to future utilization of the waters allocated by the compact.

We tried hard to meet the objections raised by the Senator from California. I did appreciate the point he raised. He made the point that this Congress could not bind any future Congress. He is making the point that we are trying to say that certain things should be done in the future. Because of the point made by the Senator from California, and because of the very fair and friendly way in which the point was raised, we went to the trouble of rewriting the whole section so as not to bind any future Congress. But we permitted the Senator from Colorado to go home and say, "I did not settle for the small amount of water now being given to Colorado."

We who are in the upper basin States recognize that our claims to the water come merely because of our geographical position, and not because of the water we contribute to the stream. My State receives a substantial percentage of the water—11 percent or so. Yet all we contribute is the water of the San Juan River, which is a tributary of the Colorado. I do not wish to commit myself, in case the Senator from Colorado and I get into an argument subsequently.

But nearly every drop of water in the Colorado River rises in his great State, and the San Juan River flows across a corner of my State, giving New Mexico an opportunity to use it.

I say frankly to my friend, the Senator from California, that I supported this provision because I wanted the Senator from Colorado to believe that we felt that his State had rights in the matter, and that when the time came we wanted to see that his State received its rights. I say to the Senator from California that I recognize his position; but we went as far as we could go in meeting a valid objection he raised, at the same time recognizing the rights of the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for stating his position, as well as that of the other members of the committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not intend to labor this amendment; and so I intend to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, unless the distinguished Senator from Colorado wishes to ask a question at this time. If so, I now yield to him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, it has already been pointed out that before any of the future participating areas can be recognized they must meet all sorts of tests, must cross all sorts of hurdles, and must be submitted to the other States for approval. If every project should become authorized we would still be within the water allocation made to the upper basin States.

I repeat what the Senator has said: Colorado contributes over 70 percent of the water of the stream. I say, not in a contemptuous sense, but as a matter of fact, that the State of California does not contribute a single drop of the water. I do not know exactly what importance that fact has, but it has something to do with the emphasis with which we explain these matters.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Colorado suggest that any of the States through which that magnificent stream runs contribute any water to it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply say that the State of California, which contributes the most complaint, contributes the least water; that is what I am saying.

I repeat that if there is constructed every participating project which possibly is thought of—every project which challenges the Bureau of Reclamation to produce facts and figures, in order to show its feasibility—if all of them are found feasible, if Congress approves their construction, and if all of them are constructed we shall still be using less water than the amount allocated to Colorado under the compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not dispute that point, either. But I am pointing out that people who have lived and made their living in my State since the 1870's have been able to use the waters of the river which came from Colorado; and over the years the population of that

area has grown, and the demands have increased. So, Mr. President, when on legal questions of interpretation the people of Colorado take one position, and the people I in part represent take another, is it any wonder that I have tried to reach a fair conclusion by saying, "Hold this up until the Supreme Court decides the controversy." That is what I have been urging throughout the hearings in committee and here in the Senate. But, again, that is a little far afield from the pending amendment.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions to be asked of me, I desire to yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California be so kind as to yield again to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, Mr. President; I yield once more to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish for a moment to deny to the people of the State of California any of the water they have been using in the past.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure that is the position of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish to deny them the use of any of the water to which they have a legal right at present. However, I am as anxious to deny to them water which belongs to the upper basin States as the Senator from California is anxious to have the upper basin States prohibited from using water which he thinks belongs to the people of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat that I do not want my State to get either a drop less or a drop more of the water than the amount to which she is legally entitled.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further? It will take me only a minute.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If every point now before the Supreme Court of the United States is resolved adversely to our section, we in the upper basin still will have sufficient allocation of the water to be able to meet the needs of the various projects which are contemplated or authorized or given any status at all in the pending bill. If every issue under the present litigation is resolved against us, there will still be enough water in the apportionment to the upper basin to make it possible to meet the needs of all the projects which are covered by this bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be glad to yield, although I do not wish to be guilty of delaying the procedure. I have another amendment to submit, and, first, I wish to have the pending amendment disposed of.

However, I now yield to the Senator from Utah for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, instead of asking a question, I shall speak in my own time, in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me; and I ask the Senate to adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 30 minutes under his control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to answer the argument submitted by my good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

We in New Mexico are interested in some of the water which has its source within Colorado.

At the beginning, I wish to say that I am 100 percent in favor of the enactment of Senate bill 500; but I am particularly interested in the water New Mexico should have, even though the amount be small.

I agree with the Senator from California that what California is entitled to, she should receive. But I do not want California or any other State to get one drop of water to which we in New Mexico are entitled and which we can use.

As I have said, I am 100 percent in favor of Senate bill 500, which provides for authorization of the Colorado River storage project, namely, dams known as Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navaho. Certain limitations on Curecanti and Juniper are provided in the bill. I feel that the Navaho Dam should be included so that the State of New Mexico can start deriving the benefit of the water to which it is entitled under the Upper Colorado River Compact. This dam is needed in order to regulate water for beneficial consumptive use. Until that is done, what the Senator from California has said is true, namely, the water will be going down the river, and California will get the use of the water.

There are also included a number of participating projects on which the water would be put to beneficial use. Construction of these participating projects would not be undertaken until the Secretary of Interior had reexamined to determine the economic justification of the projects, and had certified to the Congress that the benefits of such projects would exceed their cost.

Is there anything wrong with that? All the provision in question says is that if and when the Secretary of the Interior, be he a Democrat or a Republican, finds that those projects are feasible, they shall be included within the purview of the law we are now considering.

The bill also provides, with respect to the Navaho and San Juan projects in New Mexico, that in addition to the review by the Secretary of the Interior these projects must be submitted in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944. The only project which is included for complete authorization in New Mexico, therefore, is Navaho Dam, while the Small Hammond project and the Small Pine River extension would be authorized, subject to reexamination for justification. The Navaho and San Juan projects are included for the pur-

pose of assuring that they may participate in the financial returns from the power revenues resulting from the large power dams.

An additional project of considerable importance to the northern part of New Mexico is the Animas-LaPlata project, which is not included in the bill because reports are not available from the Department of the Interior. But the water is there, within our sphere.

There are many Indians residing in the San Juan Basin. We all feel sorry for them when we have a little cold weather, or when a snowstorm comes; but when we try to do something in Congress for them, we are told California needs the water. The trouble with California, I will say to the minority leader, is that if we shed a tear in Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, or Utah, California thinks it belongs to her. California wants all the water which belong to the upper Basin States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say for the RECORD that the Senator's statement is simply not correct. The State of California does not want any water to which it is not legally entitled under the terms of the compact. We recognize the fact that the upper Basin States are entitled to 7½ million acre-feet above Lee Ferry. We believe we are entitled to the same amount below Lee Ferry, divided among the lower Basin States. There is also a certain division of the surplus over that amount.

As my colleague pointed out, we do not want a single drop of water to which we are not legally entitled under the compact. We do not want to deprive the upper basin States of a single drop of water to which they are entitled. I submit that it is a gross libel and slander on the people of California to say that they are seeking to gain that which properly belongs to the upper-basin States. I have not injected myself into this discussion up to this moment, but I could not let the statement of the Senator from New Mexico go unchallenged.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that is the way the Senator feels, why is he against the proposed legislation, which seeks to carry out the purposes of that compact?

The bill has as its ultimate purpose the carrying out of the compact to which the Senator from California refers. If the Senator feels as he has expressed himself, he should be for the bill and take his chances that the right thing will be done. Under the compact California will get its share, the other States will get their share, and we poor people in New Mexico will get our just share.

Let me say something else to the Senator from California, and see if he wishes to deny it. The junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] stated that the people of California have been using the water from the river since 1872. I can point, on the map, to the town of Blanco, in San Juan County, N. Mex., where water was used 50 years before that time. California wants that water too.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that, had the Senators from all the States, the upper and lower basin States, been as alert to the interests of the entire Colorado River Basin, both upper and lower, when the Mexican Treaty was before the Senate, both the upper and lower basin States would not have been in quite the serious difficulty in which they now are.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will say to the Senator from California, on the question of alertness, that if at that time the Senators from New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming had been alert, when the original compact was made, we would not have been in the present difficulty. That was the original trouble. The irony of the situation is that the original compact was made at Santa Fe, N. Mex. However, neither Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, nor New Mexico stood up against California. The only State which stood up against California at that time was the State of Arizona, and because she did, she was able to protect rights to which she was entitled.

There are many white people in northern New Mexico who are barely eking out an existence by subsistence farming. Supplemental water in that area will improve their means of livelihood. With the additional water supply to irrigated land which can be obtained through the upper Colorado River development program, the pressure on grazing lands can be reduced, and the destruction of those lands prevented. New Mexico has had an increase in population in recent years, and the cities and towns are finding it difficult to obtain adequate municipal and domestic water supplies. Many fine people from California are now in that particular area looking for gas, oil, uranium, and other minerals which the area furnishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we in New Mexico feel that in order to progress, the proposed projects must be completed, which will enable us to increase our usable water supply. In terms of water quantities, the amount is not great, as measured by the supplies of other States in the Union. We are thinking of using all possible water from our allotment of about 838,000 acre-feet. Actually the amount which would be used by the Navaho, San Juan-Chama, and the Small Hammond, and Pine River extension projects would be in the neighborhood of 600,000 acre-feet annually, and the benefits would be very great.

So far as our water is concerned, we feel as Daniel Webster felt in the famous Dartmouth College case. New Mexico is small, but we love her.

The projects to which I am referring in this area are the San Juan-Chama, the Small Hammond, and Pine River extension projects, the Animas-La Plata, and the Navaho.

On the San Juan River, at approximately the place I now indicate on the map, is the town of Blanco, which has existed for more than 100 years. An

overflow of people from the fine State represented in part by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] came there as early as 1872 and settled in that valley. They are using only 18 per cent of the water they are entitled to use. Why? Because the lower basin States never would allow a project to be built; and so long as the project was not built in that area, or in the area of the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the water ran down the river.

We all know the law relating to the waters of the West. Usage results in the accrual of rights. One of these days it will be said that we can use that water, even if California is legally and morally right, because we have been using it for so many years, and they have not. Even Mexico may raise the same question. Even Mexico may acquire some accrued rights unless we take some action.

In the interest of humanity and in the interest of protecting the rights of every State in the Union, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from California will be rejected, and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to yield myself 1 minute. Then I shall yield back the remainder of the time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, when the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] was speaking, he raised a question about the amount of water which was to be used. I thought the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] had pointed out very clearly that if all of the comprehensive storage projects, including the participating projects in the upper Colorado Basin were built, it would not result in the use of more than two-thirds of the water allocated under the 1922 compact to the upper basin States. That fact should be made abundantly clear, so that there will be no doubt whatever as to the situation that exists.

If we strike section 2 from the bill, it will have the effect of leaving the impression that Congress intends the opposite to what the bill reported by the committee intends, namely, that Congress does not intend to have the Bureau of Reclamation go ahead with its preparation of the necessary data and engineering studies. It seems to me, therefore, that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire time only to say that the position of the committee must be one of opposition to the pending amendment.

Again I say that we took the suggestion of the junior Senator from California and adopted it so far as we could and tried to make out of it the most we could. However, we did feel that we had to protect the position of States like Colorado. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I, too, yield back the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 14, beginning with the word "available", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. When the Hoover Dam legislation was adopted, Congress provided that revenues after repayment, should be utilized for the entire Colorado River Basin. There is nothing unfair about that. When the Parker Dam legislation was adopted by Congress and when the Davis Dam legislation was adopted by Congress, it was provided in each case that the revenues, after repayment, should be placed in the Treasury of the United States. There is nothing wrong about that.

The bill before the Senate provides that the revenues, after repayment of the Colorado River storage project costs, shall be utilized exclusively for the benefit of the upper basin. There we have a distinction made which to me is unfortunate.

In the three pieces of legislation to which I have referred, revenues after repayment were not sequestered for one State or for only half of the Colorado River Basin. Provision was made that the revenues be utilized for the benefit of all the States in the basin. In the case of the Parker and Davis Dams, it was provided that the revenues be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

My only desire, therefore, is to have my friends, the authors of this bill, consider adopting the same type of yardstick in this proposed legislation that was adopted in the others.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from California brought this up in the committee, and his statement was as fair there as it is here, but it is difficult to study all the other legislation proposed and to decide in a few minutes what should be done with it. As I understand the Senator's statement, he is trying to equalize the situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does he not propose to strike out the word "upper",

have the amendment sent to the House, and in that way try to deal with it before final action is taken?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would have to consult with the ranking minority member of the committee, but I assume that he would not be averse to some such amendment as that, with some clear understanding that the idea is to amend the Parker Dam Act and the Boulder Canyon Act, and then try to bring them into conformity.

If the Senator from Colorado is agreeable to that, and the Senator from California is agreeable to striking the word "upper," I realize that he has a valid point. It is not fair to take the revenues from Boulder Dam and apply them all up and down the basin, and take the revenues from the other dams and apply them only to the upper States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from California have recognized what I, too, think is a basic lack of reciprocity between the upper basin States and the lower basin States so far as handling the revenues to which reference is made are concerned.

I think it would be unfair for the upper basin States, getting revenue from Boulder Dam, to keep all their own revenues. I believe they should be separated. I believe the lower basin States should be allowed to keep their own revenues and we will keep our revenues.

What is the best way to do that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be agreeable, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, to take the amendment to conference with the understanding that we will try to work it out, provided the Senator from California limits it to striking the word "upper."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be so changed; and I would accept the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that he will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think the attitude taken by the distinguished Senators from New Mexico and Colorado, as well as by my colleague from California, is very sound. As I understand, what they are seeking to do is by amendment to get the matter into conference, so that the question of handling the funds may be determined on an equitable basis. If the funds derived from the Hoover Dam, the Davis Dam, and the other dams in the lower basin now go to the entire basin account, then all other funds should be allocated in the same way. If they are to be handled on an upper basin-lower basin basis, possibly that would be the right solution. But I agree that, under the circumstances, we should either have the policy

established that they all go to the entire basin account, or there should be an equitable adjustment so that the funds from the lower basin would go to the lower basin account and that the funds from the upper basin should go to the upper basin account. But we should not use one yardstick for the lower basin and another yardstick for the upper basin.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think what we are talking about specifically is what to do with the revenues from Boulder Canyon, because that is the only project in the lower basin which, as I understand, makes a special allocation of all its revenues to the whole basin. Therefore, I should like to be very sure that the RECORD states exactly what we have in mind. I think it is entirely clear that we are asking that the revenues from the upper basin be made available to the upper basin projects and the funds from Boulder Canyon be dedicated to the lower basin. If that is the case, I support an amendment of that kind. I wish to make it very clear, however, that when the bill goes to conference we shall not lose the point, because it is a very important matter to the upper basin States. It is a most important matter, and there should come back from conference something along the line we have indicated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to yield this point, either. I realize that the Senator from California has put his finger on a question which should be considered. It is in that spirit that I suggested that the amendment be taken to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The matter will be in conference in the form in which we have discussed it. I do not wish to yield something which is now in the bill for a conjecture that something like it may come back from conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say to the Senator that I do not know who the conferees will be. I do not know whether the House will pass the bill. All I can pledge is my best effort to see that it will be presented in conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. This is a very important matter to the upper basin States, for the reason that there are many projects in the bill which, at best, will not come into being for many, many years to come, and it is recognized that the proceeds from power in the upper basin States have to contribute to these projects. What I am trying to arrive at, in my own mind, is how we can be certain that there will be brought back from conference a bill which will contain terms such as those which have been discussed.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from California will yield to me again, I should like to point out to him that the people of the lower basin States are as anxious to modify it as we are, because Hoover Dam will be paid off in approximately 30 years, whereas some of the others will be paid off in 80 years. If by

some strange working of fate the bill should not come back from conference, then I think the Secretary of the Interior would promptly suggest a bill dealing specifically with the subject.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield, first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I rise to ask a question of both the Senator from California and the Senator from New Mexico. When this matter was discussed in committee it was my understanding that the proposal was made that the Boulder Canyon Project Act could be amended so as to be in conformity with the provisions of this bill. The question I should like to ask is this: If we adopt the suggestion made by the junior Senator from New Mexico will that open the door so that in conference we can amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act and put the same provisions into it for the lower basin States as this bill has for the upper basin States?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall first say, so that there will be no question in the minds of any Senators as to my position on the matter, that I shall oppose the bill. I am going to ask the Senate to reject it. I hope the Senate may take that position.

Meanwhile, however, I do not think I am inconsistent in suggesting on the floor, as I did in committee, some amendments which I offer in good faith and which I believe to be reasonable. I welcome the acceptance by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] of a theory that all these projects should be treated equally with respect to revenues after repayment of construction costs.

I should be quite agreeable in this instance to the recommendation which has been made by the Senator from New Mexico, in which the Senator from Colorado joins, to have the matter taken to conference, if there shall be a conference, and to endeavor in conference to bring into accord the present distinctions in treatment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from California that the difficulty was that when an attempt was made to draft a simple amendment, it was found that it was not quite so easy to do. When we tried to adapt the Boulder Canyon Act, that was not so difficult. All that was necessary to be done was to insert the word "Lower" before the words "Colorado River Basin." But it was necessary to deal, as well, with Davis Dam and Parker Dam, and that involved some commitments. It looked like a very difficult situation to handle.

I thought it would be wise to ask the counsel of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to study the problem and to submit language which would deal with the whole matter properly.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I am entirely in accord with the theory which is sought to be adopted for both the upper and lower basins.

The question which has arisen in my mind is, Will the situation be confused more by this amendment, making the revenues available to both the upper and lower basins, rather than by opening the door whereby an amendment to the Boulder Canyon Act, including Parker and Davis Dams, could be adopted at a later date? If the Senator can give assurance that we will not get into a worse position, rather than a better position, I shall certainly agree to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I cannot give an absolute assurance. All I can give is assurance that we shall do the best we can.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment relates directly to the matter of income from the project after all payments to the United States for the cost of construction have been made.

I did not understand the language the Senator had offered. Has he a copy of the amendment, so that I can compare it with the language of the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have modified my amendment, at the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, so as to strike out the word "upper."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withdraw the preceding part of his amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, the amendment would be on page 10, line 12, as follows:

After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that the provision as the Senator from California would amend it?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is.

Mr. WATKINS. All that is done is to strike out the word "upper." Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I desired to have the record clear about that. In accordance with the parliamentary situation, it is necessary to take some action on the amendment. It cannot be left to some future arrangement. The provision must be amended now; it cannot be amended later.

I have no objection to the theory, if this is the best way to handle the matter. I agree that the money which is derived from the lower basin projects should be used in the lower basin; and that the money which is received from upper basin projects should be used in the upper basin. I do not think there should be any commingling of funds. We in the upper basin will have our developments under way when the lower basin has accomplished most of its developments. So there should be a complete separation of the funds.

I do not object to the amendment as it is drawn. If some other wording is necessary, it can be taken care of in conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from California.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated J. 61286 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "Echo Park."

On page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out ", Navajo and Echo Park" and insert in lieu thereof "and Navajo."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering en bloc the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. NEUBERGER. On these amendments, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second, according to the result of the last call of the roll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How many Senators did the Chair count?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a sufficient second for the request for the yeas and nays will require the approval of 18 Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the amendment at great length today, because yesterday both sides of this issue had considerable—I might say ample—time to discuss the merits of the question.

Briefly, the amendment provides only that the Echo Park feature of the proposed upper Colorado River project shall be deleted. In the upper Colorado project there are 39 separate units, including 6 proposed storage dams. My amendment would eliminate authoriza-

tion for one of the storage dams, that at Echo Park.

The reason for the amendment is simple. The Echo Park Dam would flood a substantial portion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

For nearly half a century it has been the basic policy of this Government that the national park system shall be free of commercial development, whether by the United States Government or by private corporations. That policy has been adhered to without deviation. If the Echo Park project is authorized, that policy will have been breached.

There are now pending in various parts of the country no fewer than 16 requests that commercial activity be authorized in various national parks or monuments. The lumbermen want to log some of the great pine and spruce rain forests in Olympic National Park. Some persons desire to construct dams in the Glacier View region of Glacier National Park. Some persons want to divert portions of the Great Yellowstone Lake for irrigation.

If the basic principles governing our national park system are violated at the Echo Park site, these other groups will have equally compelling reasons to seek diversion of water from Yellowstone, to construct a dam in Glacier Park, or to engage in the logging and cutting of forests in Olympic National Park.

The Government cannot say to one group, "You can breach national park system doctrine in the Dinosaur National Monument," but to another group, "You have to obey that doctrine in Olympic National Park or Yellowstone National Park."

The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], capable and brilliant as he always is, pointed out this morning, with the aid of photographs, that the inundation of Dinosaur Monument might actually enhance its beauty. I do not think there is in this country a single national park or monument whose scenery or grandeur would be enhanced by having it converted into a lake or reservoir.

Furthermore, let me say it is a basic policy of the national park system that the area in a park shall be unimpaired. Let me also say that such an area is not going to be unimpaired if it is flooded out.

Whether a great reservoir would make a place more beautiful or not might be open to debate. I do not happen to think that a reservoir would add to the beauty of Dinosaur National Monument any more than it added to the beauty of Hetch Hetchy in California, which was the subject of much controversy in the days of Governor Pinchot and John Muir and other great conservationists and naturalists.

It is possible that some persons might think that the beauty of a place is enhanced when four-lane highways, reservoirs, and golf courses are constructed. We might even eliminate the squirrels on those golf courses. But there are others who believe that there are areas—and they are comparatively small in size and number—that ought to be kept

as nearly as possible as nature formed them before the white man came to this country and exploited so much of it.

I think that is the basic issue at Echo Park.

Before I conclude this brief opening portion of my argument, I wish to point out there has been a great deal of discussion about the legal question involved. In 1938, when the President of the United States proclaimed the Dinosaur National Monument, he referred only to a distant site, not Echo Park, but to the so-called Browns Park Reservoir, in the reservation, about which there has been so much discussion.

Mr. President, the basic issue at stake is not a legal one; it is one of conservation. Surely there is no doubt of the fact that the Congress of the United States has the right and the authority to change policy regarding a national park or a national monument. But, Mr. President, the people of this country for years to come will never forgive this Congress if it permits, for the first time in history, the breaching of the boundaries of our park system with this sort of commercial development.

In conclusion, I wish to say, that I am a supporter of the upper Colorado storage project. The distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who made such a profound and convincing argument for the project, knows well that I am a supporter of the project. There are among the conservation groups, for whom I have the privilege to speak today, however incapable or unworthy I am of being their spokesman, some who wanted me to oppose the entire project. I declined to do that, because I believe that the intermountain West needs water, needs power, and needs this general kind of development.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should merely like to state that those of us who are highly interested in the bill appreciate very much the fact that while the Senator from Oregon has opposed a portion of the bill, he has stated, very forthrightly, his general position in support of the development of reclamation projects in the West. I did not want the opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation to him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very kind remarks.

Mr. President, I am merely asking that one of the six storage reservoirs be deleted from the authorization contemplated by the bill. I ask that the bill, if it should pass and go to the House of Representatives be so amended as to eliminate the Echo Park authorization, and then perhaps, either in the House, or in the House committee, or in the conference committee, some alternative site can be provided which will furnish equal storage, or nearly as much storage, but which will not breach established policy or invade either a national park or national monument.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is advised that he

has used 8 minutes of the time allotted to him, and has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is necessary in this discussion to get back to fundamentals. To have any kind of reclamation project, there must first be water, and in the intermountain area, where snow falls on high mountains and melts and runs down steep canyons for long distances until finally the waters flow into the ocean, it is necessary to have storage facilities to hold the water until it is needed.

I have gone over this matter before, but it cannot be emphasized too strongly in this debate. I should like to point out that the map which stands at the rear of the chamber is a general picturization of the area where are to be located the various dams which we claim are necessary to store the water which belongs to us under the Colorado compact, and which also would make it possible for us to fulfill the commitments to the low basin States under the 1922 Colorado River compact.

I was asked this question a while ago by a Member of the Senate: Why do we need these big dams? Glen Canyon is the number one storage dam for water. We have to store water because, as I have pointed out, we have to supply the lower basin States with water for consumptive use, according to the compact; and it is necessary for us to take water from the tributaries of the Colorado—from the Green, the Yampa, and the other streams of the upper basin—so that we can have water for the use of our towns and for industries, because the snow which falls in the wintertime melts in the spring, and it is necessary to have these storage dams or reservoirs, to keep the water from flowing to the sea and being lost forever.

The No. 1 storage dam, from the standpoint of efficiency, is the Glen Canyon Dam. The No. 2 dam, from the standpoint of efficiency, is the one at the Echo Park site. It has been recognized as being one of the best locations for the storage of water and the development of power; that has been recognized from the earliest days, from the time of the making of the first studies by the Army engineers and others. For many years a continuous study of the entire area has been made. The Echo Park reservoir is second in efficiency because it has room for a large quantity of water; and it is a deep canyon, where evaporation does not occur at the rate at which it does in shallow reservoirs. Echo Park is not only beneficial from those points of view, but it is also strategically located, so that when the second use of the reservoir is made—that is to say, the production of power—it is located in such a way that the power can go into one of the great power markets on the eastern slope of the Colorado, and also to the power markets on the western slope. It is not quite so close to Salt Lake City as it is to Denver; but it is located in such way that it will take care of the Salt Lake City situation, as well.

In the operation of this project it will be necessary to have the other dams

constructed—namely, the Flaming Gorge, which is shown by the cross-hatched area indicated on the map in pink; and the Cross Mountain, now known as the Juniper project, which I now point to on the map, just east of Echo Park; also the Split Mountain, which is just below Echo Park. Echo Park will help make all the other reservoirs become much more efficient. Echo Park will be used to supply the peak demands for power. It has a large volume of water which can be turned on immediately, to respond to the heavy demands when the power load is at its peak. For that reason, it will help the other projects and make the whole arrangement much more feasible than it otherwise would be.

The program contemplates the construction of transmission lines from Glen Canyon to Echo Park; and, of course, there will be transmission lines to the marketing centers, where the power will be marketed.

As I have stated, the first requirement in our area is water. Power is worthless to us unless we have water. Of course, we could develop power by means of the use of coal, although at greater expense—approximately 7 or 7½ mills—and perhaps in the future we could develop power from uranium, although no one knows what that prospect amounts to. At any rate, such power will not be cheaper than the self-renewable source of hydroelectric energy. The principal point is that there is no substitute for water.

So, Mr. President, by means of this project, we shall accomplish two purposes. First, we shall be able to develop the necessary water; and, second, from the same program we shall be able to develop power at no extra cost to the people of the upper Basin States or to the people of the United States, who will loan us the money, to be repaid over a period of 50 years, for each of the projects.

I have made this explanation several times to the Senate, but on previous occasions a smaller number of Senators were present.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me? I should like to ask a question.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. In the event the provision for the Echo Park site is eliminated from the bill, will not it place in doubt the development of the irrigation projects in Wyoming, at the points marked on the map—at LaBarge, at Seedsdakee, and at Lyman—for the reason that it will be extremely difficult, except in years when there is an abundance of rainfall, to fulfill the commitments at Lee Ferry?

Mr. WATKINS. Not only will it be extremely difficult to fulfill the commitments at Lee Ferry, but it will be difficult to fulfill the commitments for the central Utah project.

It is also contemplated that in the comprehensive program, water may be pumped directly from Echo Park, to take the place of other water which will be taken in the Uinta Mountains, in Utah, in connection with the Utah program.

At this time, Mr. President, I should like to discuss other phases of the situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have received a great many letters from residents of my State who are very much concerned because they fear that the enactment of this bill will result in destroying one of the great national monuments of the country, which includes deposits of dinosaur bones, coming from centuries ago. I have been told by the Senator from Utah and by other Senators that the dinosaur relics are below the Echo Park site, and that the Echo Park site really was not a part of the original national monument which was established for the purpose of protecting the deposits of dinosaur bones. Is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from New Jersey is entirely correct. I shall now indicate on another map just how that is.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I have received many letters to the effect that if I vote for this bill, I shall be voting for the destruction of one of the great natural wonders of the world. I believe it is not clear to the public that, in the first place, this site is not a national park, but is a national monument, and originally comprised only 80 acres, although now it includes approximately 200,000 acres, and that the part we wish to preserve as a monument will be entirely outside the area to be inundated by this reservoir, so far as concerns covering with water the area in which these relics are located.

Mr. WATKINS. As regards the location of the dinosaur bones, Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Dam will not in any sense of the word inundate any of the area where the Dinosaur Monument was originally created.

Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is to be found a pamphlet, entitled "The Colorado River News." It has been published by the citizens of the upper basin States. The pamphlet includes a map which is outlined in red.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Utah has expired. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is under control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire how much more time the Senator from Utah wishes to have.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall need to have at least 15 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 additional minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I have already had 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator from Utah to say that he desired to have an additional 15 minutes, and I have yielded that much additional time to him. Does he desire to have more time?

Mr. WATKINS. I think I shall need more time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much more time does the Senator from Utah think he will need?

Mr. WATKINS. I may need 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah all the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has yielded to the Senator from Utah, the remaining time, namely, 20 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to examine the folder to which I have referred, including the map which gives the key. First, let us see where the original national monument was. By examining the lower lefthand corner, Senators will find that the area of the original Monument was 80 acres. It is supposed to be shown in white on the map, although it has been somewhat smeared in the course of printing; but it is a little tract with an arrow pointing to it. That was the original Dinosaur Monument, created in 1915 by President Woodrow Wilson; that was done under the Antiquities Act, under which the dinosaur bones discovered in this area have been protected. Many of the bones have been excavated, but some still remain there.

In 1938, the Monument was expanded by a proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to include more than 200,000 acres. The Monument was thus increased in size some 2,500 times, without any additional evidence of any kind that there were in the additional area more prehistoric bones or other antiquities to be taken care of.

I am not quarreling with that, because I think it was a good idea to go through with the program they had in mind at that time. My only objection is that they are trying to get away from the program which was announced in those early times.

It will be noted that the area in black covers all the area in dispute here with respect to Echo Park. The river bottom and the sides of the canyon had all been reserved in prior withdrawals, a long time before 1938, when President Roosevelt issued his Dinosaur proclamation. Those withdrawals are now in full force and effect. I submitted the documents in my speech of March 28, when I gave a complete documentation of the various steps which were taken in the creation of this monument and in its expansion, and also the interpretations made by competent officials of the Department of the Interior of the United States.

So all this area in black, which takes in the entire river area, is a reserved area. There was a reclamation withdrawal in the North, called Browns Park. That is at the top of the map, looking north. That is not in dispute. Even the conservationists admit that that was actually reserved. But what they overlooked for a long time was the fact that all the other area had been reserved, and that the reservations were still valid, legal, subsisting reservations. I submitted the documents at that time. It

required an hour and a half to go through that speech, and I know I shall not be able to crowd that presentation into 30 minutes at this time, so I shall not attempt to do so.

I point out, however, that the people of the State of Colorado and the people of the State of Utah are vitally interested in this question, and they were at the time. They were not asleep. They were not allowing the expansion of the monument to take place without finding out what was going to happen, and the program which was intended.

In 1936, some time before the proclamation of President Roosevelt was actually entered, the late Senator King, of Utah, who was a Member of the Senate for many years, wrote a letter to the Department of the Interior in which he said:

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of a letter under date of January 22 from Gov. Henry H. Blood, of Utah, in which attention is called to a matter of great importance to the State. He refers to studies which have been made of lands along the Colorado and Green Rivers in Utah with a view to their possible development as national monuments or national parks, and he suggests that these areas possess latent possibilities as sites for reservoir development, irrigation and other purposes; also that there are mineral resources which are susceptible of development. The Governor states that unless specific reservations are made covering the matters referred to the State would be blocked in the construction of reservoirs, etc., and the right to locate and develop mineral resources might be denied to the State or to individuals.

I shall be glad if this matter may receive your attention. Certainly the State ought not to be deprived of the benefits which may result in the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River for power or irrigation purposes nor the right to the mineral wealth within the area referred to and locked up within areas within the boundaries of monuments which may be established, or public parks which may be created.

I am advising the Governor that I have brought this matter to your attention and stated to him that as soon as I heard from you I would further advise him.

I shall be glad to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. KING.

So the people of the area were vitally interested in this question. They were told, when the proposal for the expansion of the original Dinosaur Monument from 80 acres to more than 200,000 acres was advanced, that they would have the right to build reservoirs and develop the reclamation possibilities. They were told that such rights would be preserved. They were also given assurance that they would be permitted to continue grazing in the area. It takes in a great deal of territory. They were led to believe that that question had already been taken care of.

I will say, to the credit of President Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, and Mr. Demaray, the acting director of the National Park Service at that time, that in my opinion they carried out, to the letter, a sort of gentlemen's agreement which was entered into with respect to the expansion of the monument from 80 acres to more than 200,000 acres.

Mr. Demaray wrote a letter to the Federal Power Commission on August 9, 1934, on this subject. In that letter he said:

Gentlemen, we are studying the possibility of setting aside certain lands in northwestern Colorado as a national monument. The area considered is within the watershed shown on the map marked exhibit H (a), which accompanied an application of January 30, 1932, of the Utah Power & Light Co., for a preliminary permit, and which is on file in the Denver office of the Reclamation Bureau. The proposed monument would be affected by the Echo Park Dam site and the Blue Canyon Dam site, as indicated on the enclosed map of the proposed monument.

With that letter he enclosed a map.

Continuing to read from Mr. Demaray's letter:

Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is of course an existing right.

I wish Senators to keep in mind that language:

I continue to read from the letter of Mr. Demaray:

However, we feel that we should call this to your attention. If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration.

I read the concluding paragraph:

If you have any data or reports on this area, we would appreciate very much receiving copies.

Very truly yours,

A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Director.

In reply to that letter, Mr. McNinch, the head of the Federal Power Commission said:

This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation and power possibilities on the upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In another portion of the letter he said:

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1,500,000 to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the greater part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of these streams.

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission

believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme.

He had been asked if he could cancel out the power withdrawals.

The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.

I now come to President Roosevelt's proclamation. I have just quoted language from Mr. Demaray, and his reference to existing rights.

The proclamation is dated July 14, 1938. This was carrying out the understanding among Mr. McNinch, of the Federal Power Commission, Senator King, Governor Blood, and the people in the Uintah Basin area. Incidentally, that is where I resided for many years. I know that area very well. The people there had the understanding that they were fully protected. The people of western Colorado had the same understanding, because meetings had been held with them by park representatives, who told the story, and told what it was hoped to accomplish.

Let us examine the language of the proclamation, which was signed July 14, 1938, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah:

Whereas certain public lands contiguous to the Dinosaur National Monument established by proclamation of October 4, 1915—

That is the Wilson proclamation on the 80 acres—

have situated thereon various objects of historic and scientific interest; and

Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as an addition to the said Dinosaur National Monument;

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906 (ch. 3060, 34 Stat. 225 U. S. C., title 16, sec. 431), do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following-described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument: * * * aggregating 203,885 acres.

The Acting Director, Mr. Demaray, himself said that all existing rights would be protected and would be subject to existing reservations. Of course a water-power withdrawal is an existing right.

In a letter written by the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission he lists 10 power withdrawals in addition to the Browns Park withdrawal. I shall not read all of the letter. It was included in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate on the 28th of March, and the RECORD is available to the Members of the Senate.

Along with that letter the Chairman enclosed a map. I have had that map blown up to show the situation. It shows the location of the lands in question.

I point to the map to indicate the location of the original site of the 80 acres mentioned in the Woodrow Wilson pro-

clamation of 1915, when the Dinosaur National Monument was created. The blue sections of the map, of course, indicate the river. I point to the Green River, a tributary of the Colorado, and also to the Yampa River.

The area marked in orange shows the area that was withdrawn in this power withdrawal. These would seem to be some overlapping, but practically the entire area was withdrawn prior to 1924.

In the letter he makes the statement that the status is the same as it was in 1938, and that the existing rights are still in good standing. That statement is contained in the letter to which I have referred.

That is the situation, Mr. President. We feel a little bit put out by our good friends, the conservationists, who contend, in effect, that we are trying to invade the parks. Incidentally, I am just as good a conversationalist as they are—did I say "conversationalist"? If I did, that is a rather good description of them. They are not only good in conversation, but also in correspondence, I might say. They have the mistaken notion that we would invade their territory. The fact is that the people in the area resent the invasion by them of the water withdrawal area and the power withdrawal area. We believe those reservations should be respected. They were made pursuant to an order, and they are still there.

Mr. Demaray wanted to get them out of the way. Mr. Ickes wrote a letter to the Federal Power Commission and asked if it were possible to have them excluded. The Federal Power Commission stood its ground and said these places were too important for power and water development purposes, and therefore it refused.

President Roosevelt, in his proclamation, refers to the valid existing rights, and then describes the lands in Colorado and Utah, by providing:

Do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument.

When he reserved the lands from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws, he excluded homesteading and that sort of thing.

Without reading the whole proclamation, particularly the portions dealing with the description, I come to the following:

The reservation made by this proclamation supersedes as to any of the above-described lands affected thereby, the temporary withdrawal for classification and for other purposes made by Executive Order No. 5684 of August 12, 1931, and the Executive order of April 17, 1926, and the Executive order of September 8, 1933, creating Water Reserves No. 107 and No. 152.

They are not involved at all in this matter.

I continue with the Roosevelt proclamation:

The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and

for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916—

The proclamation cites the statute—except that this reservation—

That is, the reservation reserving all this area as a monument—

shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project.

There is a specific reference to the language used by Mr. McNinch in his letter when he said he had no objection, if the operations of the Federal Water Power Act would be permitted to be carried on.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I have only 2 or 3 minutes, but I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission support the view of Mr. McNinch?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; he does. I received a letter from the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in which he said these lands were all in the withdrawal status and were in good standing at the present time, and valid.

Mr. President, it would be impossible for me to discuss, in the few minutes left to me, all the matters that ought to be called to the attention of the Senate. If Senators will read the speech I made on the subject they will find a clarification of all those points.

The Roosevelt proclamation was issued in 1938. A year later, Mr. Margold, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior at the time of the issuance of the Roosevelt proclamation, was called upon to interpret the power of the President to create a national monument subject to other uses. Mr. Margold held that the President did have the right to create a national monument. The question came up with respect to a monument in the Boise area, namely, the Boise National Forest. There, too, power and water withdrawals had been made.

The question was whether the President could issue a proclamation establishing a monument subservient to the dominant use by the water program. He held the President could do so. This is a specific opinion in point.

He was asked the additional question whether the Federal Power Commission had the power to issue licenses. He said it did not.

The conservationists have taken that statement to mean that that gave the President the power to cancel out everything, because the commission did not have any power to issue licenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from Utah is permitted to speak for an additional 5 minutes, will the proponents of the amendment be granted an additional 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate agrees to such a request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of additional time be allowed, and that the time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, be equally divided between the opponents and proponents.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an appointment to speak in New York this evening. We are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. I should like to vote on this measure. Therefore I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

The time on the other side is under the control of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it would be a tragedy if a power dam were constructed in the magnificent Dinosaur National Monument at Echo Park. We must not despoil this wonderful handiwork of nature.

After listening this afternoon to the debate on the pending amendment, which I hope will carry, I should like to refer to the witnesses who appeared before our committee urging that the committee delete Echo Park as one of the storage unit dam sites.

It will be recalled that the bill in its original form called for the construction of but two storage units. They have now been increased to six. Among those who appeared to urge the committee to delete Echo Park were many representatives of the great conservation organizations of the country. One of the organizations that appeared through a representative was the Izaak Walton League of America, whose reputation for sound conservation principles is known in all the States of the Union. It was vigorously opposed to the Echo Park Dam site. Opposition was registered also by the Sierra Club and the National Parks Association, and many other conservation groups across the country.

A distinguished American who bears a distinguished name, Ulysses S. Grant III, testified at length against the proposed desecration of that magnificent beauty which is one of the joys of all the people of this country.

I am going to read a paragraph from this morning's New York Times' editorial.

Says the New York Times:

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 1 further minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I read, Mr. President:

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the national park system, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowing filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO PARK DAM

With the speed that bears evidence of political maneuvering the Senate has suddenly taken up the administration's billion-dollar upper Colorado Basin storage and power project containing authorization for the bitterly controversial Echo Park Dam. It is difficult to believe the Senate can be cajoled into voting for a measure that could pave the way for the destruction of the National Park System.

The entire upper Colorado scheme itself should be subjected to severe analysis and questioning. The plan involves construction over the next half century or so of a number of water storage, power, and irrigation projects in eastern Utah, western Colorado, and neighboring areas. The first phase of it is to cost over a billion dollars, with sums of untold magnitude yet to come. Quite apart from the governmental propensity for underestimating costs, the entire economic basis for this scheme has been cogently attacked as unsound. It has been shown by such authorities as former Governor Miller of Wyoming that power to be produced at the Echo Park site, for instance, will cost \$883 a kilowatt, while power produced by steam-electric plants in the same area costs less than \$170 a kilowatt. The potentialities of cheap atomic power development have, of course, not yet been scratched. So far as the irrigation aspects are concerned, the estimated costs range from a few hundred dollars to a thousand or two per acre. There are far cheaper ways to increase our agricultural surpluses, if we insist on doing so.

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the National Park System, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowly filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not wish time to be granted to me under false pretenses. I am still not quite clear in my own mind. I wish to ask some ques-

tions. I am predisposed to the amendment which the Senator from Oregon has offered.

Let me say, first, that I feel convinced as to the rights involved in the matter. I am convinced that the proponents of the dam have rights. I am not at all disposed to grant that this region is going to be beautified by the projects for which the bill provides. Lake Mead, which is situated near a large town, has a sandy bathing beach. This region is not so accessible, and the beauty of the canyon will be diminished when the stored water covers the lower part of it and there remains what is between the water level and the top. So far as its beauty is concerned I do not get any thrill from the photographs showing what the canyon will be like when the water level is raised. That canyon floor is beautiful. I happen to be a lover of canyon floors. I raise the question in my own mind as to how many conservationists or other persons will visit it. Two a month? One hundred a month? Two thousand in a year? I do not know. But I do not look with pleasure and satisfaction on seeing that floor inundated.

It is being advertised. This debate advertises that canyon floor and those steep walls, Steamboat Rock, and the other natural features.

In looking over the storage units, it would appear from a hasty and unprofessional examination that of the various storage reservoirs indicated, 1 or 2 more might replace, certainly in order of priority, the Glen Canyon Dam. It is a matter of regret that the arguments, pro and con, have been focused on that dam. I should like to see the Glen Canyon site left as it is and then find out whether many people in the United States really want to visit it and see it. If they do not, let us build a dam there.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes remain.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on some of the arguments made to justify the Echo Park proposal.

To begin with, I think it is quite significant that in the proclamation of President Roosevelt in 1938 the only reservoir site referred to is Brown's Park, which is on the extreme northern end of the monument. It is vastly different from the proposed Echo Park reservoir, both as to size and through its impact on the scenery of the monument.

I should like to say, with reference to the inquiry concerning the dinosaur bones, that there is no issue as to the bones, and the distinguished Senator from Utah knows that to be so. President Wilson set aside an area of 80 acres in 1915, to take care of dinosaur relics. This project has no relation to dinosaur bones. That was merely a name. The question now is based on scenery, grandeur, and outdoor majesty. That is what is threatened by this proposed project—no more, no less.

No mention whatever was made of Solicitor Margold's opinion rendered shortly after the monument was expanded to its present size. He said:

Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Federal Power Commission by specific provision in the National Monument proclamation would be ineffective, since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an executive proclamation of this character.

If the argument is valid that filling up this magnificent canyon—which is now in its natural state—with a reservoir will enhance its scenic beauty, then every single river canyon in every national park or national monument in this country is imperiled by being filled up with water. If this argument is valid, then why not build dams in Glacier National Park? The issue is quite as valid at Glacier Park so far as anything enhancing scenic beauty is concerned. Why not decide that a reservoir would add to the wonders of Glacier Park? The theory is the same.

The distinguished Senator from Utah made some mention of grazing, because grazing is allowed in the monument. In practically every national park, grazing is permitted because of the grandfather rights which inhere in the people who had ranches there before boundaries were created. In this respect I might mention Grand Teton, Bryce Canyon, Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota, and Grand Canyon National Monument. In all those places grazing has continued. But that is no argument for the Echo Park Dam.

Those rights had to be extended, because the people had been on the land prior to the establishment of the monument or the park. Their rights continued so long as they or those directly associated with them should live.

Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the population of the country increases and as the real income per capita increases, there will be, of course, an even more rapid increase in the demand for recreation. Already our national parks are overused and overrun. It is vitally necessary to build up new places to which people may go to be revived in spirit and recharged with energy. The question is, What kind of recreational areas are needed? There can, of course, be lakes—and I may say that I think Lake Mead behind Boulder Dam was an addition to the recreational facilities of that region.

But certainly there should be also wild places and deep canyons where man may acquire some humility and see how little he is in comparison with the great works of nature, and so that his mind may go back into the enormous stretches of time which have gone into the making of the earth and the development of life on the earth. That is an experience which we all need and particularly city people.

It would be a very tepid United States if all the streams were dammed and if everything were reduced to a series of placid lakes. At times we should feel that nature is tough, that nature is awe-inspiring.

That is why I think we should maintain the Dinosaur National Monument,

rather than dam it and create another lake.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall not take all the 9 minutes.

The basic issue in the amendment resolves itself into a single question: Does Congress and in this particular instance the Senate, wish to authorize the construction of a commercial power and irrigation project within the borders of a national park or monument? This has never taken place in the entire history of the National Park System since its establishment.

If this amendment shall be defeated today, I presume that the Senate will then proceed to take that step. I believe it will be a backward step. I believe it will be a backward step for recreation, for scenic and esthetic values, and for other similar areas throughout the Nation.

As I said yesterday, there exist in other places in the United States—in the Olympia peninsula, in Glacier National Park, in Yellowstone Park—similar pressures by persons who want to cut trees, who want to divert lakes, or who want to dam rivers, to have this sort of commercial development, either by the Federal Government or by private industry, take place within a national park or a national monument.

In this respect, I completely agree with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], even though he knows we are not entirely in agreement upon the project as a whole—he opposes it; I support it—that there should be some inviolate areas in the United States where the basic word of our national park system continues to prevail—and that word is unimpaired. If the Dinosaur National Monument is flooded, it will no longer be unimpaired. That is clearly evident.

I conceive the basic issue today to be the integrity of our national monument system. A national monument is a basic part of the national park system. It is true that a national monument is established only by Presidential proclamation or Executive order, whereas a national park is established by act of Congress. Nevertheless, many of the present national parks once were national monuments. So a threat to a national monument is, in every sense of the word, a threat to the entire national park system. That is what my Echo Park amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 or 3 minutes of his remaining time, so that we may complete a discussion we started yesterday?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think there was ample time for the discussion yesterday. I yielded sufficiently then.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short statement I have prepared on the Neuberger amendments be printed in the RECORD just prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

As I have indicated, this upper Colorado River bill includes in its present form one project that I most earnestly oppose, along with millions of other American citizens throughout our Nation. We all have heard of it again and again—Echo Park—for conservationists from all over the country have protested this with almost unprecedented determination. Last summer the Speaker of the House himself in a statement said that the whole upper Colorado project had died in the 83d Congress because there were so many protests against the Echo Park Dam. And we in the Senate have heard the protests echoing in our Halls in this 84th Congress also.

Why these protests against this one dam—the Echo Park Dam?

There is one simple answer. It would be an invasion of our National Park System, and, Mr. President, the American people intend to see that the National Park System is not invaded but rather that it is held sacred for themselves and their children and their children's children.

Thirty-nine years ago next August the President of the United States approved an act (39 Stat. 535) whereby the Congress established a National Park Service, and provided for the orderly and effective administration and protection of the national parks and monuments. In that act the Congress also carefully defined the "fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations."

I am using the exact words of the act, which goes on to say that this "purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." For four decades the people of the United States have respected this policy and today they are more deeply determined than ever before that the National Park System shall be so handled in our own day that these areas cannot only be enjoyed by their increasing millions of visitors but also that they shall be left unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

During all these four decades there has not been a single successful challenge of this policy. Year after year has strengthened it and endeared it to the American people.

No wonder the people have so violently and so persistently protested against the Echo Park Dam. For this dam would be deep in the heart of one of the truly superb areas in this National Park System. Unimpaired? The Echo Park Dam would so seriously impair the Dinosaur National Monument in which it would be located that never again could this area serve the

great and unique purposes for which it is now so deeply cherished.

Do the gentlemen who advocate or condone this desecration of the Dinosaur National Monument think that I exaggerate? Let me then, try to present to you a brief description of the marvelous canyons with which we are here concerned. Then let me try to give you some idea of what the proposed dam would do to this area. And I am sure Senators will agree that this dam is indeed a threatened impairment of a superbly great unit in our National Park System.

But, first of all, I should like to make it plain that I am opposing the Echo Park Dam for what it will do and not for what it will not do. Proponents of this dam would have you believe otherwise. They want you to think that the Echo Park Dam is opposed because it would flood dinosaur bones, and then they eagerly point out that it will not inundate any of these great skeletons. Mr. President, I know that the great dinosaur quarry in this monument is many miles down the river from Echo Park. I know full well that the dinosaur quarry is high in the hills above the river it overlooks. I know that these interesting bones are high and dry and safe from the Echo Park Dam. But, Mr. President, I know also that the Echo Park Dam will create a reservoir through mile after mile of marvelously beautiful canyons for which the monument was deliberately enlarged from its 80-acre quarry to its present size of 209,744 acres so that it could preserve these canyons. That is the reason conservationists oppose it.

Let me try to convey to you some idea of what these canyons are like. I regret that I have never seen them with my own eyes. Indeed, I am among the many Americans who, never having seen them, all the more earnestly support their protection. In the meantime we see such areas through the eyes of others. Our National Park Service describes for us each of the areas within the system it guards and interprets. I have here the folder which it publishes on the Dinosaur National Monument—a folder which carries the name of the Secretary of the Interior and is surely reliable. Here again we read:

"The National Park System, of which Dinosaur National Monument is a unit, is dedicated to the conservation of America's scenic, scientific, and historic heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

This leaflet admires the Dinosaur National Monument because it "contains a vast wilderness almost untouched by the works of man." And well we may cherish a few such areas in our great country where the wilderness can still live on in its natural splendor. Let me continue with this description of the Dinosaur National Monument.

"Its principal scenic features are formed by the Green and Yampa Rivers, which flow through deep, narrow canyons with precipitous, strangely carved, delicately tinted sandstone cliffs. * * * Between high vertical walls of tilted strata that represent millions of years of geologic processes, the Green River, largest tributary of the Colorado River, flows on its turbulent way toward its junction with the Colorado."

These canyons, which the Department of the Interior in this folder describes as "spectacular" and "awe-inspiring"—these canyons this Department's Bureau of Reclamation calls a great "storage vessel" and wants to use as a site for reservoirs that would inundate these turbulent wild rivers and replace their unspoiled scenic splendor with one of the works of man.

Through the eyes of one of the conservation leaders who has testified at the hearings on this bill I get a further impression of the grandeur of these scenic wild canyons. Again and again, he says, he has tried to convey to his friends some of the grandeur

of this area, and he says he has come closest to it by thinking first of the Washington Monument.

Think of the Washington Monument. Think of its nobleness. Then, and I am paraphrasing a part of the statement by the Wilderness Society's secretary that appears in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Think of standing at the base of the Washington Monument and looking up at its grandeur. Imagine the respect and admiration which you feel as you place yourself before its 555-foot thrust into the sky. Think then again of a solid natural rock a hundred and fifty feet yet higher than the Washington Monument, towering above you like the prow of a great boat a mile long, its hidden mast a thousand feet high—a monolith of natural rock, golden and brown. Imagine the awe and wonder you feel as you place yourself before its massive stand against time and the elements. That is Steamboat Rock.

Think too of the river flowing against the side, winding around the prow of this great rock. That is the Green River. It has come through the Canyon of Lodore and at Steamboat Rock has found its confluence with the Yampa. These waters have flowed through canyons which surpass, in the scenic superlatives of those who have known them, even this marvel of Steamboat Rock.

The testimony continues:

"Climb out of these canyons onto the great plateau land in which they are cut. Walk out along the edges of the chasm, on Harpers Corner. Stand on this tongue of solid rock that holds you 2,000 feet above the river. And see the abyss to the right and left and straight ahead of you.

"Turn right and see far below you Steamboat Rock that awed you in its presence. See the river flowing around it. Trace its course on up the stream, and the course of the Yampa River's Canyon as it winds to its confluence with the Green there in Echo Park.

"Turn to your left. Find yourself looking straight downstream between the narrow walls of Whirlpool Canyon, and the rough river, deep in the chasm, so apparently quiet from your height.

"Try to tell yourself that there before you, deep below you, the United States Bureau of Reclamation—your Bureau of Reclamation—wants to build a dam 525 feet high above that river. The Echo Park Dam. And up to its concrete foot would come the reservoir waters eventually of another dam—Split Mountain—inundating those whirlpool rapids.

"Turn again to your right and imagine the reservoir waters of that impertinent dam below you. Imagine Echo Park inundated. See nothing of Steamboat Rock but a stone island in a storage basin deep almost as the Washington Monument is high."

What great impairment this proposed Echo Park Dam would be in this superb part of our national park system. As the witness, who himself had been there, went on to say:

"Think of the rivers and the canyon-bottom riverside camp spots above Echo Park, buried in the waters of that basin—along the Green's marvelous canyon of Lodore, and along the deep meanders of the Yampa—that great gorge twisting through colored rock around unnumbered bends, loops, and curves. Think of the unique wild, river-running recreation in these canyons, the like of which is nowhere else, flooded out forever by miles and miles of a storage reservoir."

We thus can gain some idea even at this great distance of the magnificence of these canyons. We can see why they properly belong in our National Park System. And we can see why a dam almost as high as the Washington Monument would most assuredly impair and desecrate this great area. Truly,

"it would destroy one of the unique, irreplaceable, scenic, wild wonders of the world."

How greatly the American people will benefit from the preservation of these canyons is only beginning to be realized. At the Senate hearings from which I have quoted another conservation leader told of the great experiences that are being enjoyed by vacationists traveling in rubber boats down the turbulent rivers of these deep canyons, savoring their splendor and feeling the grandeur of their wildness. Read of it, and I am sure you will be impressed with the great and appropriate use being made of this priceless scenic treasure of the American people.

This Dinosaur National Monument should be preserved as the unit of the National Park System which it now is and should remain.

Let me make plain, however, I do by no means wish to deny to the people of this region the full economic use of the waters that flow through these canyons. I am the rather convinced that reservoirs can be provided to the maximum extent needed or desired or possible without invading this national park area. I am impressed with the great choice of an alternative program that would respect the sanctity of this area. And I am convinced that these alternates should be much more fully studied than apparently they have been.

Let me refer to just one of several alternatives. This one would be an increase by some 35 feet or so in the height of another dam already in the program—the Glen Canyon Dam. It is indeed, along with the Cross Mountain Dam, the only dam that is expected to produce power at a cost less than it can be sold for. The Department of the Interior itself posed this heightening of the dam at Glen Canyon as a possible alternative to constructing the Echo Park invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument. But the Reclamation planners threw out this possibility—for just one reason, they said—added evaporation losses.

I can well understand the importance of saving every possible acre-foot of water, and I can well understand the force of an argument that claims that an alternate proposal will lose an extra 165,000 acre-feet of water. That was the claim with reference to this alternative. But when I see this claim—under the scrutiny of critics concerned with preservation of the national parks—reduced first to 77,000 acre-feet and then finally brought down to only 25,000 acre-feet, I say let us by no means sanction an invasion of our national park system on the basis of such recommendations as these.

Our people, in the increasing stresses and strains of our modern life, need the resources of scenic wilderness, and those who follow us will need them more. It is a thirst all its own. Truly the people of America need the best possible development of their water resources. But let us not needlessly sacrifice any great need of the American people. Let us be absolutely sure that we are proceeding on a program that will be sound from all points of view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is absent. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Accordingly, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—30

Barkley	Gore	McNamara
Byrd	Green	Neely
Case, N. J.	Hennings	Neuberger
Clements	Humphrey	Pastore
Cotton	Ives	Potter
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Duff	Kefauver	Russell
Ervin	Knowland	Smathers
Frear	Kuchel	Thurmond
Fulbright	Lehman	Williams

NAYS—52

Alken	Ellender	McCarthy
Allott	Flanders	McClellan
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barrett	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bender	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Payne
Bible	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jackson	Scott
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Kerr	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Long	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Watkins
Daniel	Malone	Young
Dworshak	Mansfield	
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bush	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Dirksen	Mundt	Welker
Hill	Murray	Wiley
Kennedy	Purtell	

So Mr. NEUBERGER's amendments were rejected.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the so-called Neuberger amendments were rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 2 hours are available for debate on the bill itself; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, and the time is to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and it is to be under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of Senators on either side of the aisle as to what Senators may desire to speak at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very short statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time does the Senator from California desire to have?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no desire to speak for more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well. Do any other Senators on this side of the aisle desire to have time?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I voted for the Neuberger amendments because as far back as I can remember, I have been a very vigorous proponent of conservation policies, both in my own State and elsewhere throughout the Nation.

However, Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill itself. I shall so vote despite the fact that the bill will have no immediate benefit to the people of my State. I shall vote for the bill in accordance with my long-held philosophy that what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for every part and every section of the Nation.

I am convinced that within measurable time the Nation will need greatly in-

creased cheap power, publicly developed. I am also convinced that within measurable time the Nation will need more reclaimed and irrigated land on which to grow the food which an ever-increasing population will require. We shall no longer be able to indulge in the doubtful luxury of cutting back our agricultural acreage and reducing agricultural production. Instead, we shall be crying for more food, and we shall be doing so within a shorter time than many people now contemplate.

I hope that my thesis that "what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for every section of the Nation," will be generally followed by the Members of the Congress of the United States. If we have failed to follow that philosophy or if hereafter we fail to follow it, I believe that all progress on a national scale will stop.

If we, in Congress, vote for appropriations only because they help benefit our own particular States, we shall be entering the field of provincial or parochial legislation; than which nothing would be more dangerous to the interests of or to the advancement of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, we who live in New York State have a great power potential in the Niagara River, which can produce power for New York State and for the adjacent States as cheaply as any power development in the entire continent. The development of cheap power from the Niagara River will be of great benefit, not only to New York State, but to the entire Nation; and it will cost the Nation and the taxpayers of the United States nothing, because the project will be self-financed by the State itself.

Just as I shall vote for the pending bill because I believe so strongly that it is greatly in the national interest, so I hope and believe that my colleagues will vote for other projects which are in the broad interest of the entire Nation, not solely in the local interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I heartily agree with my friend, the Senator from New York, that what is good for the Nation is good for each section of the Nation. It is because I believe that this project is not good for the Nation that I oppose it; and I ask that my colleagues consider very briefly the great disadvantages which are connected with it.

In the first place, Mr. President, although I have supported public power developments in the Tennessee Valley and on the Columbia, and although I am supporting them on the Snake, and although I would support such development on the Niagara, the area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the

Columbia River, only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River, only one-third the flow of the Tennessee River, and only one-half the flow of the Snake River.

The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over \$500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost at most dams on the Columbia River.

The cost of generating power at the most favorable damsite covered by the pending bill, namely, Glen Canyon, will be from $4\frac{1}{4}$ to $4\frac{3}{4}$ mills per kilowatt-hour. The cost of generating power at Echo Park will be close to 6 mills; and the cost of generating power at the damsite further up the river will be more than 6 mills.

In comparison, the generating costs for the multiple-use dams on the TVA average 1.1 mills; on the Columbia, about 1 mill including indirect costs, and at Hells Canyon, the estimate is only $2\frac{1}{2}$ mills, directly.

Mr. President, if we were to pick out one of the worst places in the United States at which to erect a public-power project, we would pick out this one. It is extraordinary, to me, that an administration which refuses to establish power projects on the Columbia River, and is opposed to the big dam at Hells Canyon, and turns a cold shoulder at the proposal to construct a project on the Niagara and which calls public power "creeping socialism," is nevertheless picking out this project, where, in my judgment, even the power project will not pay out. So much for the power features.

What about the irrigation features, Mr. President? The appropriation for power is proposed to be \$650 million. I doubt that this sum will be paid out, for power from coal oil and shale oil in this region can probably be produced at the same or a lower cost. Furthermore what about atomic energy? Will not that be ready for use in 60 years?

The irrigation features are to cost approximately \$915 million, but this amount does not include interest; and for 10 years, no retirement on principal will be made, and no interest will be paid; and then, for 50 years more, while the principal is supposed to be retired, no interest will be paid on the money allocated for irrigation.

So for 60 years, plus the construction period, however long that may be, no interest will be paid, but the taxpayer will have to pay interest upon the bonds which will be floated to finance the project, or he will give up purchasing power out of taxes. So if we add the hidden interest costs, which will amount to more than \$1,100,000,000, the cost of the irrigation features will come to more than \$2 billion and the total cost of all features to probably close to \$3 billion or more.

What will be the irrigation cost per acre under these features? Yesterday I placed in the RECORD tables which will be found on pages 3914 and 3918, showing that the average cost of construction, let alone interest, for the project as a whole would be \$952 an acre, on the basis that 3 acres of supplemental land

can be taken as the equivalent of 1 acre of new land. If we include interest, the cost per acre will be \$2,142. The cost for the central Utah project with interest will be \$3,953. These are fantastic figures. The most fertile land in the country, land in the central belt of Illinois, which I have the honor in part to represent, is not worth more than \$600 or \$700 an acre. Here we are proposing to spend more than \$2,000 an acre for land which, when fully irrigated, will not be worth more than \$150 an acre. On a big project, we will be spending approximately \$4,000 an acre.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from California yield me more time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We must remember that these irrigation projects are not in low altitudes, as were the early projects in Arizona and California. They are not projects as those are at which the average temperature is high and the growing season long. They are, instead, in the mountains, at altitudes from 4,500 to 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, where the winters are long, and where the crops produced will be, by the admission of the proponents of this bill, primarily alfalfa, hay, and some corn, for the feeding of live stock. These are costs which cannot be borne. Irrigation can better be used to put water on the more fertile land of the Midwest to raise the yields per acre there. This would be at a very low cost instead of at the astronomical costs of this project.

Who, then, will pay for this gigantic project? The interest is forgiven, and borne by the taxpayer. Eighty-five percent of the principal is not to be paid by those who own the land, but is supposedly to be saddled on the power revenues.

If we examine the costs and the power revenues, we find that it would be almost impossible for the power system to earn the money necessary to meet the 85 percent of direct irrigation costs. This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program. It is about the worst program I have ever seen during the time I have been a Member of the United States Senate. It would be a waste of the taxpayers' money. It would probably create huge dams behind which there would be some idle reservoirs, because the water is being overpledged. It would destroy the recreational features of Echo Park. To my mind it is not justified on any basis whatsoever, and I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. President, if it is in order, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not repeat the arguments which

have been made. I think the time may come when this proposal will be justified. My principal objection at the present time is on the ground of timing.

As to the power aspect, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has already discussed the cost of the power features of the bill. I do not think there is any dispute about the high costs of power production in this program.

As to the flood-control project, it is of no great importance, because flood control is not a major problem, nor is it a principal objective of this program.

As for the production of food, it seems to me that the argument which has been made by the proponents of this bill is again untimely. I would assume, as a wild guess, that perhaps when our population reaches 300 million or 350 million, there may develop a sufficient pressure upon the food-growing capacity of the country to warrant bringing in submarginal lands by irrigation methods under such a program as that proposed here. I have no doubt that in time conditions will arise under which such a program as this will be justified, but I certainly think it is not justified at the present time, when our real problem is the disposal of surpluses rather than the production of additional food.

When we are spending large sums of money and racking our brains for methods to dispose of unwanted surpluses, and taking out of production large agricultural acreage far greater than the area of land which would be brought in here, it seems to me rather ridiculous to enter into a program of this magnitude on the theory that we need the production for food.

As I say, I have no doubt that in time that need will arise, and in time this program will be justified on the basis of economics. However, it seems to me that it is entirely out of order at the present time, and that there are many other programs which are far more pressing than this one and far more justifiable on many counts, either for the production of power or for the conservation of water for purposes of industrial or municipal use.

I say again that I believe that in due time, when the population in this area has grown to a sufficient extent—and it is growing at the present time—there will arise a sufficient demand for water for municipal and industrial use to make a much better case than is presently made.

Finally, there is certainly no great pressure for employment in this area. If this proposal were before us during a period of great unemployment, and this program were being offered as a program which would serve to some extent the purposes I have mentioned, and in addition, relieve unemployment, that would be an argument in favor of the program.

On the contrary, in our country generally there are greater signs at the moment of a tendency toward inflation than toward deflation. So I think there is no argument whatever to justify bringing forward this proposal at this time.

In conclusion, I feel that I must vote against this program because it is im-

provident, extravagant, and unjustifiable under present conditions, recognizing that, in due time, it is probable that the development of this country will justify a program of this kind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my junior colleague from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I very much regret that I am compelled to oppose this bill. However, the fact is that this bill is bad legislation. It is bad because it bypasses the precedents established by the Congress. It is bad because it is premature. I wish very briefly to demonstrate why I make these statements.

First of all, I wish specifically to point out to my brethren in the Senate that this is not a bill sponsored by the administration. The administration made a comparatively modest recommendation. That recommendation was in favor of two storage units, so-called, and a dozen participating projects, so-called, whereas the bill before us provides for 6 great storage units and 33 participating units.

Let me read from the report of the Department of the Army, printed in the committee report accompanying the bill when it was reported to the Senate:

Comments on 4 of the major units (Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, and Curecanti) in the comprehensive plan covered by S. 500 and on the participating projects are not practicable from an engineering and economic standpoint without an up-to-date engineering and economic report. However, with respect to the two remaining units (Echo Park and Glen Canyon), the Department of the Army has reviewed a report of the Department of the Interior and has advised that Department that these two storage projects appear to be justified.

The Department of the Army does not endorse the legislation as it comes before the Senate. I wish particularly to add that when the Senate committee saw fit to increase the number of participating projects from 12 to 33, it placed in the legislation new proposed participating projects which in no event have received the test of feasibility from the Department of the Interior or any other agency of government.

It is said by the proponents of the bill that in regard to these projects they will be required to come back to Congress a second time.

That is a novel approach. That is not the pattern which has been laid down in the Senate in years gone by. The logical question that occurs to anyone is why should there be this initial and indirect attempt to approve projects upon which at this moment there has been no determination with respect to feasibility?

The States in the Colorado River Basin many years ago entered into an agreement or compact. That compact apportioned the waters of the Colorado River. There are various interpretations given to it by the States which approved it: Indeed, at this moment the sovereign State of Arizona is plaintiff in a law suit in the Supreme Court of the United States in which the State of California is defendant. The very questions which are at issue concern themselves with how the Colorado River compact shall be interpreted.

The United States Government has intervened in that suit, and a motion has been made to join as parties to the action the other States which signed the Colorado River compact. The bill before us rests on the compact. Until the Supreme Court decides what it means, until the legal dispute among the States is finally settled, how can this proposed Colorado project be administered properly?

It seems to me that here is an instance where prematurity is the very essence of the legislation before us. Those who seek to have the legislation adopted interpret the compact in one way, as I endeavored to explain on Monday, and those from the State which I in part represent interpret it in a different way.

I suggest that until the States involved know what the rights and liabilities are under the compact we should not pass legislation of this prodigious size, as we are being asked to do. Many issues are involved here, Mr. President. The debate here on the floor has touched upon legal questions, economic questions, and policy questions. All of them are important. I look across the aisle and I see the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I congratulate him for the comments he made concerning the bill from the standpoint of economic feasibility.

We should refuse to pass S. 500 at this time. Here is a bill calling for the expenditure of \$1½ billion with a built-in guaranty that more will be spent later. It will not settle a dispute. It will multiply the dispute. And in the process, it tosses away the long-time precedents of the Congress. It ought to be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I had prepared a speech on the bill, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to deliver it at this time. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I have made a careful study of the question whether authorization of the Colorado River storage project should include the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects located in the canyon unit, added to Dinosaur National Monument by Presidential proclamation in 1938. My study has considered the following main questions:

1. Whether the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain power and storage projects would create a bad precedent by violating the general principle that national parks and monuments should be immune from such developments?

2. Whether the alternative projects, proposed in the main by General U. S. Grant III, on behalf of the National Park Association, etc., are acceptable as substitutes for Echo Park and Split Mountain projects in connection with the legitimate use of the upper basin on a sound multipurpose basis?

3. Whether any other alternatives should be considered in an effort to find a compromise solution which would preserve the most important scenic and other features of the canyon section of the monument, while at the same time preserving the legitimate

interests of the upper States in water and power?

4. Whether the project, as proposed to Congress by the Department of the Interior, represents the best multipurpose plan for developing the upper Colorado Basin in accord with the general principles of division of water, set forth in the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948?

BRIEF ANSWERS

In very brief, my answers to the four questions are as follows:

1. I think there is no question but that the Presidential proclamation of 1938, adding the Green and Yampa Canyon area to Dinosaur Monument, was intended to safeguard the future opportunity to develop the storage and power values of the various sites, and was further intended to assure the people of the region, as well as the Federal Power Commission, that the enlargement of the monument would offer no new obstacle to such development. Actually, the principle itself is not a blanket exclusion of developments involving water storage, irrigation, and power from national parks and monuments, but a reservation to Congress of the decision where such uses of park or monument lands are proposed.

2. I do not think that the proposed alternatives are acceptable as substitutes for the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects.

3. An attempt to determine whether a compromise approach, designed to modify the Bureau plan in such a way as to preserve the most important features of the canyon unit of the monument without serious impairment of the Colorado River storage project, could be found produced a negative answer.

4. I think that the project as proposed to Congress is a sound embodiment of the principle of multipurpose river-basin development to provide water storage and hydroelectric power, as well as a considerable protection of lower-basin projects against encroachment of sediment. I concur, however, with the Federal Power Commission comment that somewhat larger power installations than proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation will be warranted.

In reaching these conclusions I have not ignored the very great importance of affording as many people as possible opportunity for the kind of recreation which comes from association with the untouched wilderness in all its forms of beauty and historical interest. In all my association with river-basin programs I have tried to bring about planning which would recognize these as well as the other more material values as worthy of equal consideration. My effort has been to harmonize all possible uses of the resources of a basin in a multipurpose plan.

In this particular case, I have come to the conclusion that (a) the people of the upper basin States are entitled to the best use of their water resources for purposes of economic development; (b) they were assured that this would not be blocked by expansion of Dinosaur Monument to include some of the best water storage and power sites in the upper basin; (c) the entire basin is replete with scenery and records of geological history; and (d) without minimizing the extent to which the natural beauties will be altered by the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects, the conclusion is warranted that there will remain an expanded opportunity for the people of the country to enjoy outstanding recreational values of a wilderness, scenic, and prehistoric record character.

I shall now turn to some more specific observation supporting my general appraisal of this project.

ECHO PARK WOULD MEAN NO VIOLATION OF PRINCIPLE

The 1938 addition of about 200,000 acres, including the Echo Park and Split Mountain

sites, to the 80-acre Dinosaur National Monument, was accomplished by a Presidential proclamation which deliberately and effectively reserved the opportunity to use those sites, or any other sites, for power development.

The Federal Power Act, as amended in 1935, by definition, excluded national parks and monuments from the operation of the act. The President's proclamation said that the designation of this additional Green and Yampa Canyon area as part of Dinosaur National Monument "shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act as amended."

What the opponents of the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites overlook is the fact that the act's definition of the public lands which are open to the operation of the Federal Power Act is not a part of the operation of the act but a restriction of the field within which it operates. The Presidential proclamation was accurately directed at limiting the designation of these public lands as monument lands to the extent that the result would be to prevent development of their power resources. In other words, the proclamation said that reservation of these lands for monument purposes was not complete to the extent that it would preclude operation of the Federal Power Act within their boundaries.

The whole background of the "except" clause in the 1938 proclamation makes this clear.

The House committee 1954 hearings show that in 1934 the Acting Director of the National Park Service wrote the Federal Power Commission stating that the contemplated proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument "would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is, of course, an existing right." The letter stated further: "If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of the administration" (hearings, p. 727).

Chairman McNinch of the Commission replied emphasizing the magnitude of the power resources involved. He referred to the Utah Power & Light Co. application, estimating the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site at 130,000 horsepower and pointed out that this estimate, as well as the estimate of the Woolley United States Geological Survey report on the Green River, would justify installations of about 300,000 horsepower. He continued:

"It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1.5 million to 2 million horsepower of installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the great part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any plan for development of these streams.

"Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time will elapse before the power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to creation of the monument if the proclamation contains specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted" (p. 728).

From this 1934 letter, antedating the expansion of Dinosaur Monument, it becomes very clear that there is no ground for the charges of General Grant and his associates that the whole purpose of those supporting the Echo Park project is to undermine the national park principle.

In November 1935, Secretary of the Interior Ickes again took the matter up with the Federal Power Commission, calling attention to the fact that the Utah Power & Light Co. had voluntarily withdrawn its application for a preliminary permit for a power site reservation along the Yampa and Green Rivers. He said: "This suggests that the power resources of the section may not be as important as originally believed," and continued: "I shall appreciate receiving your opinion as to the possibility of releasing the power withdrawals that exist in the area. By such action the proposed monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of the administration" (p. 731).

Chairman McNinch, in a reply of January 9, 1936, said the Utah Power & Light withdrawal of its application "was not based on any reduced appraisal but was taken because the Commission was unwilling to carry the application any longer in suspended status, and the growth of the company's power market did not justify the construction of any of the plants within the comparatively brief period which would have been allowed under the Power Act after the issuance of the permit." He continued: "Nothing has occurred to change the status of the Power Commission withdrawal, or power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721, and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93, which are also involved."

Chairman McNinch quotes the paragraph from his previous letter to the Director of the Park Service beginning "Regardless," quoted above, and added:

"Since receipt of your letter this whole subject has been given further study but no information has been developed to change the views of the Commission as expressed in the above quotation" (pp. 731-732).

Clearly, it was to meet the Federal Power Commission's estimate of the importance of this portion of the basin as a power resource that the President's proclamation contained the limitation: "except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended." In other words, the judgment of the Government's principal power agency was accepted, that the value of the resources involved for hydroelectric power development was too great to permit an unconditional setting aside of the area as a monument outside the operation of the Federal Power Act.

And it should be recalled that this exchange of letters occurred after the 1935 amendment to the Federal Power Act definitely excluding national monuments from its operation. Under the proclamation the land set aside was not a national monument for the purposes of the Federal Power Act.

Certainly it was not the intention of the President, or his advisers, to mislead the people of the upper Colorado States or the Federal Power Commission. In this connection a portion of the statement of Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, in the House committee 1954 hearings is significant. He referred to contemporary representations by the late Senator King and the late Governor Blood, both of Utah, expressing concern about the expansion of Dinosaur National Monument to include the upper Green and Yampa River canyons. He quoted Governor Blood as stating that "unless specific reservations are made covering the matters referred to, the State would be blocked in the construction of reservoirs, etc." He continued:

"In response to these representations, even the then Acting Director of the National Park Service, Mr. A. E. Demeray, assured Senator King by letter in May of 1938 that the reclamation and power reservations were being incorporated in the President's 1938 order designed to protect the water power developments within the monument." (House 1954 hearings, p. 230).

One other fact should be noted. As embodied in the successive amendments to the Federal Power Act which have been the focus of discussion, the principle is simply that developments for power involving national park or monument resources shall not be undertaken solely on the decision of an administrative agency. The decision, in such instances, is reserved to Congress itself. And Congress has acted to leave the door open for the utilization of national park lands for reclamation purposes in the case of both Grand Canyon and Glacier National Parks. Apparently a major objective of the Federal Power Act amendments was to prevent an administrative agency from allowing private exploration of park resources.

This interpretation conforms with the provision of the Glacier National Park Act of May 11, 1910, "that the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project" (House 1954 hearings, p. 595).

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES ARE INADEQUATE

In dealing with possible alternatives to individual projects in a Federal agency program for multipurpose development of a river basin, it must be taken into account that the entire comprehensive program is, in a real sense, a single integrated project with its individual site developments hydraulically, as well as economically, integrated to produce the greatest values from the basin's water resources.

This means that it is necessary to look at more than the contrasting storage capacities, evaporation rates, energy production at site, or even initial costs of the alternative projects, to determine their comparative effects on the total basin project. Provision for storage is located not only in terms of its contribution to power development at the site and downstream but also in terms of the control of flows contributed by various tributaries, etc., where storage of high flows will have to be carried over many years.

A review of various presentations of alternatives to Echo Park and Split Mountain suggests that there has not been sufficient weight given to this consideration. There has not been ample consideration in terms of the economic feasibility of the entire undertaking. Specifically, I find the following among the rather serious inadequacies in efforts to recombine Bureau of Reclamation figures to produce and justify alternatives:

1. Minimization of the significance of the additional evaporation losses due to the lower reservoir elevations and greater surface areas of his alternatives. No river basin planner can dismiss 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet, representing not only additional land brought under cultivation and additional industrial water supply, but also additional kilowatt-hours at the reservoir site and below. Water is valuable, particularly in the arid States.

2. Opponents did not use comparable figures in presenting Bureau of Reclamation project figures to develop comparisons between proposed alternatives and the Echo Park-Split Mountain combination. In specific instances there were used figures for cost and energy output which, because representing different periods in the planning or operation of the projects, are not comparable.

3. Alternatives would not treat the Colorado River storage project as a whole, including all the objectives and especially the importance of release and routing of stored water in terms of the schedules for long-range requirements of cyclical storage as well as the development of maximum supplies of economical power from the combination. Thus, in offering the combination of the Cross Mountain and Gray Canyon units as the initial development, in place of the Echo Park unit, there was presented the full energy production figures for the Bureau's Gray Canyon unit, although about one-third of its energy capacity is due to the stream flow regulation provided by the Echo Park unit which he eliminates.¹

4. In minimizing the need for about 48 million acre-feet of total storage, there is a failure to take account of the multiple purposes to be served by the combination of reservoirs in the Colorado River storage project. These include not only provision for cyclical storage to enable upper States to make full use of their allotted consumptive use of water but also dead storage to make possible economically feasible power development and sediment storage to prolong the life of such downstream units as the already constructed Hoover (Boulder Canyon) development and the projected Bridge Canyon power development. An additional 200 years life for the Hoover Dam unit is not to be easily dismissed.

5. Little, if any, attention was given in proposed alternatives to the problems of project timing associated both with the orderly filling of reservoirs and the overall economics of developing a feasible program for enabling the people of the intermountain States to use their share of Colorado River water for constructive regional development. And no one should minimize the difficulties which face those responsible for enabling the upper basin States to use their share of the water.

In this connection it may be noted that California thinks of the Glen Canyon project, to which there is no real opposition, as benefiting primarily the lower basin, in terms of both sediment control and power. California wants the 800,000 kilowatts of power transmitted downstream to be picked up by the Los Angeles transmission lines at Hoover Dam, rather than upstream to combine with Echo Park and other upper basin power to support economic development in the Mountain States.

It is my conclusion that substitution of proposed alternatives would significantly reduce the water for consumptive uses and the hydroelectric power available to the upper basin States. I also conclude that it would jeopardize economic feasibility of the entire program.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO ECHO PARK QUESTIONABLE

In connection with the work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee, agencies of the Department of the Interior under my direction (1951-53) worked out alternatives to certain Corps of Engineers proposed power projects in the Kennebec and St. John Rivers in Maine. These were designed to accomplish substantially the con-

¹ In the Bureau's program the Gray Canyon unit is scheduled to come into production with the following active storage behind it: Echo Park, 5,460,000 acre-feet; Flaming Gorge, 2,950,000 acre-feet; and Cross Mountain, 4,200,000 acre-feet. This total of 12,610,000 acre-feet would be about three times the storage in Cross Mountain unit alone, as used in Grant's alternative initial project. Furthermore, the Cross Mountain unit would control only the Yampa average flow of 1,617 cubic feet per second, whereas the Echo Park unit would control both Yampa and upper Green flows, totaling about 4,100 cubic feet per second.

servation storage and power objectives, while avoiding interference with important wilderness recreation opportunities in the Bigelow Mountain and Allagash River areas. The alternatives consisted in the main in shifting the location of storage and power developments in such a way as to protect and even enhance the wilderness and semiwilderness opportunities without eliminating storage of the flows of specific tributaries or utilization of important power resources.

With the relatively limited basic data available I had tested the possibility of such compromise solutions in the general area associated with the canyon section of the Dinosaur National Monument. Specifically, this compromise approach, if feasible, would not have eliminated development within portions of the monument but would have preserved to a very considerable extent the Echo Park and the Green River and lower Yampa Canyons immediately above it, including Steamboat Rock, unoccupied by dams or reservoir pools.

In other words, the alternatives would not be sought on other streams or in lower reaches of the Green River, but in the same general portion of the basin as the proposed Echo Park unit.

Specifically, I had explored the possibility of moving the Flaming Gorge Dam still farther downstream, while maintaining the same maximum reservoir elevation, or alternatively, of adding a Lodore Canyon unit. Coupled with this would be an experimental moving of the proposed Cross Mountain Dam somewhat farther downstream, to gain head and storage. Another experiment involved consideration of the possible combination of the Gray Canyon and Desolation units into a single project. In general, it was assumed that the Split Mountain site would be developed for power as part of the alternative combination.

After working with the available geological maps and checking with the Bureau of Reclamation to determine whether additional data was available, the conclusion was that in terms of one or another obstacle, including the spreading of storage over wide areas, excessive evaporation, foundation conditions, costs, etc., the probabilities were against such alternatives proving out even if the data in the Bureau's Salt Lake City office were obtainable.

There is another obstacle to finding a substitute for the Echo Park unit. It is contained in the upper Colorado Basin compact, which recognizes the right of the State of Utah to take 500,000 acre-feet a year of Yampa River water for its central Utah irrigation project. This provision is a safeguard against the possibility that full use of the irrigation water—to which Wyoming is entitled—may result in return flows which introduce enough alkaline salts into the Green River so that dilution with the mountain water of the Yampa will be required. So far as studies have been able to determine, the Echo Park Reservoir is necessary to enable Utah to exercise this right under the compact.

In general, this serves to emphasize the extreme complexity of the task of working out a feasible program for such a basin where many of the forces of nature seem adverse to full utilization of the resources. It is a gigantic task of bringing nature into cooperation with man's several major purposes.

It is my general conclusion that the Bureau of Reclamation engineers have made a sincere effort to investigate all possible alternatives to use of the storage and power resources within the expanded national monument.

A SOUND MULTIPURPOSE PROGRAM

The main issue as to whether the Colorado storage project represents sound multipurpose planning involves chiefly the question whether the losses in scenic, geological his-

tory, and other recreational and cultural benefits, through construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain units, will outweigh the particular storage and power benefits associated with those projects.

In attempting to find the answer to this question I have come to the conclusion that the prospective losses in cultural and recreational values have been considerably exaggerated by those fighting for the inviolability of a principle, which was deliberately made subject to power development at the time when Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the canyon unit.

I think that the soundest discussion of the question is found in a Report of Progress, dated May 13, 1943, submitted to the Director of the National Park Service by Frederick Law Olmstead concerning the Dinosaur National Monument region (pp. 733-735, House 1954 hearings). This was part of a Survey of Recreation Resources of Colorado River Basin approved by the Secretary of the Interior in January 1941 to contribute to the general formulation of a comprehensive plan of utilization of the waters of the entire Colorado River system. The Secretary appointed Olmstead, distinguished landscape architect, with wide experience in regional and site planning, as consultant for the survey.

The Olmstead report records certain problems and tentative conclusions in regard to the Dinosaur National Monument, as developed to date by unfinished investigations by George F. Ingalls, Olmstead, and others, "in relation to plans now in process of development by the Bureau of Reclamation for water-control projects on and near the Monument."

Olmstead's report recognizes that "reservoir construction as contemplated by the Bureau would submerge a number of sites, geologic formations, and wildlife habitats, and would alter the character of the landscape by substitution of still water for flowing streams, and by reducing the visible height of the canyon walls." It says that "the latter effect would be most disastrous at and near Pats Hole, where the extraordinary feature of Steamboat Rock would be submerged to more than half its height, and in the inner canyon of the Yampa for some miles upstream well beyond Harding Hole. The report continues:

"Nevertheless, the canyon unit would still have scenic and recreational values of notable importance and of nationwide interest. I venture to cite a very few examples,

"The canyon of Lodore, in general roughly V-shaped in section, is so deep that raising of the water in its bottom by 100 to 500 feet or thereabouts would hardly diminish its great impressiveness to a perceptible degree. Its rapids and low waterfalls now visibly continuing the process of erosion which cut all these canyons in the uplifting mountain mass as it rose athwart the rivers that once meandered across an ancient peneplain—would be changed to a fiordlike lake. Such an artificial change would not be justified in a national monument administered to preserve notable features of nature for enjoyment of mankind as nearly as possible in their natural condition; but it cannot be denied that if the area is deliberately made a 'multiple-use' area, for power developments plus any recreational values compatible therewith, a great many more people can and will derive pleasure and inspiration of a high order from traversing the canyon of Lodore in boats on a fiordlike lake than would even be able to see it all in a more perfectly natural state by shooting its dangerous rapids in boats or by following the 25 miles or more of narrow trail that might with difficulty be contrived to traverse it without much scarring of natural conditions. The upstream portions of the meandering narrow inner canyon of the Yampa, incised into the 'bench' in many places to a depth of about a thousand feet with almost vertical

walls, would appear much as at present seen from above. One of the most impressive and geologically illuminating features of the entire area would remain at the eastern end of the monument, wholly unaffected by the damming. It is where the high, bare sandstone escarpment of the unfolded strata has so obviously been sawn through, on the axis of an anticline, by the river; which there quietly flows from a broad flood plain into the dark deep canyon it has cut in the slowly rising rock. The notable outlooks from many places on the rim of the upper plateau south of the rivers, especially on and near Harpers Corner—some very beautiful, all interesting geologically or otherwise—would in most cases remain substantially unchanged in appearance (unless transmission lines, as yet not definitely planned, should be so located as to impair one or more of them seriously."

Olmstead's report summed up his chief considered impressions and opinions in regard to the scenic and recreational values of the canyon unit in two paragraphs, the second of which seems of great importance as indicating what sound multipurpose planning for this portion of the basin calls for. He said:

"1. It is without doubt sufficiently notable and distinctive and good of its kind, from a national standpoint, to justify in the absence of very strong special reasons to the contrary, retaining it as a national monument, administering it as such, and in due course of time expending a considerable amount of Federal taxpayers' money to make certain parts of it conveniently accessible by road and to provide simple conveniences for visitors and for its operation.

"2. It is not so unique and precious for such purposes (in the sense that Zion National Park is, for example), and the scenic, recreational, and related values which it would have if so administered would not be so largely sacrificed by the introduction of the waterpower developments contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation as to give very strong grounds for opposing those economic developments if and when it becomes clearly evident that the installation of some or all of those waterpower developments would produce economic values of social importance largely and certainly in excess of the economic cost of producing them. Under those conditions it would be reasonable for the Park Service to approve changing the legal status of the unit from that of a national monument to that of a 'multiple-use area' devoted to the storage and regulations of water and production of waterpower and also (to the full extent compatible with the reasonably efficient performance of that function) to conserving and utilizing the potentially great scenic, recreational, and related values of the area."

In conclusion, let me say that I shall vote for the bill because it will guarantee an adequate water supply to millions of boys and girls yet unborn, who will constitute the increased population of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado in the decades immediately ahead.

Water is essential to their welfare.

There will be plenty of gorgeous scenery and recreational opportunities available for the boys and girls throughout the country, including the very area where this project will be developed.

I prefer to look into the future and see happy faces of boys and girls benefited economically, recreationally, and spiritually by the water potential of this project, rather than to look into deep canyons, untouched by human hands and undeveloped for the happiness and welfare of our people as a whole.

However, it does not follow that the development of the water resources of this project will lead to any impairment of the wild beauty of great canyons in America. It means only that in this instance the

development of the water running through these particular canyons will be used to promote the greatest good of the greatest number.

Without an adequate supply of water, the prosperity of the area of the United States covered by this project will suffer, and it will suffer to the detriment of the entire United States.

On the basis of what I think is a clear preponderance of the evidence presented in the debate, I must conclude that the pending bill is meritorious and in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Therefore I shall vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I wish to say in addition is that I wish to compliment and commend my colleague from the State of Oregon for the exceedingly able argument and case he presented in support of his position on the amendment he offered.

My colleagues know very well that if I felt the merit of the argument was on his side of the case I would certainly lean over backward and vote with him on that issue.

However, I gave a very careful study to the bill and all of its ramifications, and I came to the conclusion that the legal argument did not support my colleague's amendment. I felt that the law of the case, so to speak, was in favor of the Echo Park project. Therefore, I voted for the project, and I shall vote for the bill.

I wish only to read the conclusion of the speech that I prepared and had inserted in the RECORD:

In conclusion, let me say that I shall vote for the bill because it will guarantee an adequate water supply to millions of boys and girls yet unborn, who will constitute the increased population of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado in the decades immediately ahead. Water is essential to their welfare.

It does not follow that the development of the water resources of this project will lead to any impairment of the wild beauty of great canyons in America. It means only that in this instance the development of the water running through these particular canyons will be used to promote the greatest good of the greatest number.

Without an adequate supply of water, the prosperity of the area of the United States covered by this project will suffer, and it will suffer to the detriment of the entire United States.

On the basis of what I think is a clear preponderance of the evidence presented in the debate, I must conclude that the pending bill is meritorious and in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Therefore, I shall vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. If it is agreeable to the able minority leader, I should like to yield myself 5 minutes and then yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall have to inquire whether there are any further requests for time in opposition.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the Senator from New Mexico will yield himself 5 minutes and yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remainder of the time controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], under the present control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is yielded back, except 5 minutes, which the Senator from New Mexico has yielded to

himself. The Senator from California yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I recognize that there is some point to the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the effect that we have agricultural surpluses on hand. He tried further to point out that these agricultural surpluses might be difficult to handle, especially in view of what may develop as a result of the passage of this bill.

I point out that the central Utah project will not be in full operation for 26 years, and that in a matter of only 7 years we expect to reach a balance between the present production of agricultural products and the consumption that will be required by the country at that time.

The Navaho project in my State will not be completed and in full operation for 27 years. We are not dealing with a present emergency. We are dealing with a situation that may arise in this land.

I think we should build our agricultural program so that we can take care of the agricultural needs of the Nation when the time arrives. At the present time there are many threatening conditions. In the New York Times of yesterday morning there was a statement saying that dust and winds have afflicted Colorado areas, that fields and ranches are barren, crops of wheat ruined, that Kansas is also affected, and that grass roots are in danger.

As the able Senator from Utah pointed out yesterday, this does not happen under irrigation, and we should try our best to tie down by crops land which has been blowing and causing great trouble.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible to reproduce the picture carried in the newspaper, calling attention to the fact that the wind takes its toll. It is stated that the wheat crop northwest of Lamar, Colo., has been badly damaged by drought and by blowing. We seek to make it possible to tie down the land.

I received in the mail within the past 48 hours a copy of a publication entitled "Land and Water," published by the Friends of the Land, a conservation movement. The publication comes to me because I am a member of the group called the Friends of the Land. I have tried to render service to those who are interested in conservation. The publication points out that our water use is growing faster than is our population. It points out that the requirements for water have been increased from 4 to 6 times in the past 50 years, whereas our water supply has been increased only twice. It also points out that as the years go by, the problem of water will become increasingly acute.

Here are the conservation people asking us to save the water of this country. What does the Colorado River project do? It builds at Glen Canyon a great dam. Not 1 drop of that water will irrigate 1 foot of land in the upper river valley. It will be held there to take care of other obligations. That water is precious. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in appearing before a subcommittee on the saline water bill yesterday, brought with him an article en-

titled "Water." He pointed out that water was becoming increasingly scarce and that this country must not be prodigal with its water; that it must conserve every drop. This project seeks to take the water of the great Colorado River and save it.

Oh, Mr. President, to be sure, power rates in the great Tennessee Valley Authority will be lower than those in the area of these projects. To be sure, they will be lower in the Columbia River Basin. About all we can make out of that is that when God formed the convolutions in the topography of this country He put the Colorado River in the wrong place. But that is not our fault. We have to take it where it is and make use of it. If power costs 5 or 6 mills as against the part of the country which is favored with only a 1-mill rate, that is not the fault of the hardy pioneers who have tried to make something out of the Mountain States. As the years go by we shall see more and more need to be careful of our supply of hydroelectric power.

There was a debate several years ago concerning the natural-gas bill, and it was pointed out during the debate that the State of New Mexico had the lowest natural-gas rate in the Union. The rate was 1.9 cents per thousand feet of gas shipped out of the State. That was the actual fact.

Within the past few months a contract has been signed providing for the movement of natural gas into the Salt Lake area at a rate of 13 cents to start and 18 cents when it is finished. Yes, prices go up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope this bill will pass.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Nelly
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kilgore	Sparkman
Curtis	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Symington
Douglas	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Watkins
Dworshak	Long	Williams
Eastland	Magnuson	Young
Ellender	Malone	
Ervin	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the final passage of the bill. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Accordingly I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Bender	Carlson
Allott	Bennett	Case, S. Dak.
Anderson	Bible	Chavez
Barkley	Bricker	Clements
Barrett	Butler	Curtis
Beall	Capehart	Daniel

Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Eastland	Kefauver	Neuberger
Ellender	Kerr	O'Mahoney
George	Kilgore	Payne
Goldwater	Langer	Schoeppel
Hayden	Lehman	Scott
Hennings	Long	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Holland	Malone	Sparkman
Hruska	Mansfield	Symington
Humphrey	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Jackson	McClellan	Young
Jenner	Millikin	
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	

NAYS—23

Byrd	Gore	Potter
Case, N. J.	Green	Robertson
Cotton	Ives	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Kuchel	Stennis
Ervin	McNamara	Thurmond
Frear	Neely	Williams
Fulbright	Pastore	

NOT VOTING—15

Bridges	Kennedy	Purtell
Bush	Martin, Iowa	Saltonstall
Dirksen	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	Mundt	Welker
Hill	Murray	Wiley

So the bill (S. 500) was passed.

FUNDS FOR EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 92) providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOYALTY DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar 140, Senate Joint Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to designate May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day. That day will be celebrated in the 48 States in accordance with proclamations issued by the governors of the respective States.

Similar resolutions have been sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars before the State legislatures; and a representative of that organization appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary this year in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 58.

Last year the Committee on the Judiciary approved a similar resolution, but too late for timely action by the Senate.

The House has already passed an identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 184. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the consideration of House Joint Resolution 184 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. It is identical with the Senate resolution which is on the desks of Senators and which was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas whether the adoption of the resolution would result in a conflict. Many years ago I sponsored and secured the passage of a resolution creating May 1 as Child Welfare Day. Until now there has been annually a proclamation of the President setting that date aside as Child Welfare Day. Will there be any conflict between that designation and the one sponsored by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I know of no conflict. According to the evidence received by the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee this year and last year, no conflict was suggested to the committee at those times.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be no conflict in having the same day devoted to two different purposes?

Mr. DANIEL. I know of none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

The Chair hears none; and the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 184.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 1st day of May 1955, is hereby designated as Loyalty Day and is set aside as a special day for the reaffirmation of loyalty to the United States of America and for the recognition of the heritage of American freedom; and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day, in schools and other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 58 is indefinitely postponed.

PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2225, the feeder airline bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry. I understand the Senate bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We are now taking up the House bill, which is not identical. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is going to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Senate bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that was my intention. I should like to state that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] held hearings on the bill. The only difference between the House and the Senate bills is the proviso in the Senate bill which leaves authority in the Civil Aeronautics Board to take care of certain airlines, such as spur lines, which might not be economically feasible. With such a proviso, the Department of Commerce and the officials in the Transportation Division are in wholehearted agreement with the bill. I thought we could take the bill to conference and then work out the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute Senate bill 651, as proposed to be amended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding the following:

"(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within 120 days after the enactment of this paragraph shall show that, from January 1, 1953, to the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant has been during the period since its last certification inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certifi-

cates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this section and the date of its application: *Provided*, That the Board in issuing the certificate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, before it is passed?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question before the bill is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a unanimous vote. All the bill proposes to do is to offer aid to a group of what are called feeder airlines, small airlines in the United States, some 14 or 15 in number, which have become an important and integral part of our airline system, have established themselves in giving service to small areas, and feed into the big trunklines.

Those feeder airlines have been operating for a number of years under what is called temporary certificates, in some cases running for as short a time as 2, 2½, or 3 years. Obviously, since they have only temporary licenses to operate their airlines, their economic structure is not so stable as it should be. Questions of financing have kept the smaller airlines from buying new equipment, because they were not sure their certificates would be renewed.

All the bill proposes to do is authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to give the small airlines, which are permanently established as part of our air system, permanent certificates, so that they may find themselves in a more stable economic situation, and may be able to obtain more modern equipment.

I might say that aiding these feeder airlines is important to all sections of the country. Because of their financial situation, they have been forced to fly with equipment which is not suitable for feeder line operation. It is hoped that by granting permanent certificates to them, the airlines will be enabled to purchase more suitable aircraft. Most of them have been using DC-3's.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] heard the testimony. I am sure he can answer any questions Senators may desire to ask him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the bill is passed would we not be permanentizing what started out as local service experiments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They were not experiments. There were some airlines

conducted on an experimental basis which dropped out of the picture; but those covered by the bill are now established feeder airlines. They operate in all sections of the country. They furnish service to the smaller communities, and feed into the main trunk lines. The feeder airlines were constantly making application to the Civil Aeronautics Board to be given permanent status, because of the deficits resulting from the type of operation they were compelled to adopt.

I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he would care to answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say the feeder lines would have no status in the way of permanentizing without governmental approval that they do not now have under their temporary certificates. If the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to have a hearing and to cancel the permanent certificates, it has that right to do so under section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act. Both the feeder and trunk lines are thus given permanent certification, but that section provides that at any time, for cause, the Civil Aeronautics Board can amend or modify or cancel the certification to fly these routes for which they are permanently certificated.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the bill place the burden of proof or evidence on the air lines, or does it place any restriction on freedom of action on the part of the Board?

Mr. MONRONEY. The provision gives the Board general freedom of action, in that 50 percent of intermediate points between terminals can be adjusted or canceled any time the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to do so if they do not generate sufficient traffic.

The principal complaint, and the only complaint, really, that was registered by the Civil Aeronautics Board was the permanentizing of the route structure. While it was well satisfied with the terminal points, it felt some of the intermediate points might not justify enough traffic or air mail service to warrant continued permanent service there.

In order to get away from requiring these lines with permanent certification, after formal hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board and on application, to discontinue service we provide, in an amendment, that the Civil Aeronautics Board, on its own initiative, can change not more than 50 percent of the intermediate points in any of these feeder airline systems if they fail to produce sufficient traffic. I feel it reasonably meets the objection of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or at least it meets what the Board was driving at.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have been wanting to see the time when we could stop the subsidy to airlines, both feeder lines and trunk lines. Does not this measure per-

manently obligate us to pay a large annual subsidy to the feeder lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. It commits us to no more than what we are doing today in the case of the trunk lines; and I think we shall see the subsidy requirements reduced once these lines are able to effect the economies which permanent subsidization will give them. In that event they will have better planes, which they can operate more cheaply, which will carry larger payloads, planes which are designed for the feeder type of service, instead of using obsolete DC-3's. They will achieve further economies in operation by being able to keep their employees permanently, instead of having them ready to leave, in order to accept employment on the permanently certificated trunk lines, where steady jobs are now available. I believe we shall save the feeder lines \$100,000 on each certification, by virtue of the fact that they will not be forced to go through unnecessary hearings every 2 or 3 years, in order to get a new lease on life, so to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. One hundred thousand dollars would not go very far toward paying the subsidy to these lines.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the subsidy last year amounted to approximately \$24 million. There are some 14 carriers. So \$100,000 represents a substantial part of the subsidy.

Mr. GORE. How many passengers were carried, for which we paid the subsidy of \$24 million?

Mr. MONRONEY. More than 2½ million passengers were carried last year. The load has been growing each year. This year the load is increasing by 20 percent or more.

In addition to carrying 2½ million passengers last year, the smaller lines transported more than 1¼ million ton-miles of airmail, more than 1 million ton-miles of express, and more than 1 million ton-miles of freight—in the calendar year 1954. That is evidence that they are growing. In 1950 they carried less than 1 million passengers.

Let me say to my good and dear friend from Tennessee that the hearing rather conclusively showed that today these feeder lines are in almost as good condition, subsidywise, as the condition in which the trunk lines, as we know them today, were when they were certificated permanently under the Civil Aeronautics Act and the grandfather clause, in 1938.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. According to the figures given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, when those figures are translated into the number of passengers, they mean that during the last year the taxpayers of the United States have been called upon to pay approximately \$10 for every passenger who traveled on the lines, whether on a long trip or on a short trip—and most of the trips are very short.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 1, 1901.

Report of the Committee on Commerce and Customs.

AN ACT

To authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, acquire, and dispose of, through the various bureaus and departments of the Treasury, such lands and interests as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act.

1. That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized to purchase, acquire, and dispose of, through the various bureaus and departments of the Treasury, such lands and interests as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act.
2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized to purchase, acquire, and dispose of, through the various bureaus and departments of the Treasury, such lands and interests as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 500

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 21, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

AN ACT

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development
4 of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin,
5 the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority
6 to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce
7 among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to
8 make all needful rules and regulations respecting property
9 belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among
10 others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, stor-

1 ing water for beneficial consumptive use, commencing a pro-
2 gram for utilization in the States of the Upper Basin, con-
3 sistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact,
4 the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado
5 River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
6 pact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid
7 and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the
8 improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydro-
9 electric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes,
10 hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to con-
11 struct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of
12 the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, res-
13 ervoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant
14 works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen
15 Canyon, Juniper, and Navajo: *Provided*, That the
16 Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which
17 will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand
18 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater
19 capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at
20 seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean
21 sea level and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation
22 Board, and that construction thereof, and of the Juniper
23 unit, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the
24 basis of further engineering and economic investigations,
25 reexamined the economic justification of each unit and,

1 accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a
2 supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the
3 President that, in his judgment, the benefits of each unit
4 will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and
5 maintain the following additional reclamation projects (includ-
6 ing power-generating and transmission facilities related
7 thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Cen-
8 tral Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry,
9 Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minne-
10 sota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its
11 confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and
12 other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee,
13 Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall,
14 Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West
15 Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East
16 River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand
17 Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Grow-
18 ers Extension, and Sublette: *Provided*, That construc-
19 tion of the participating projects set forth in this clause
20 (2) shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reex-
21 amined the economic justification of such project and,
22 accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of
23 a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through
24 the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such
25 project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reim-

1 bursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this Act
2 can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each
3 such project shall include, among other things, (i) a re-
4 appraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of
5 the project made by the Secretary after consultation with
6 the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the non-
7 direct benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the
8 total cost of construction of each participating project or
9 separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures au-
10 thorized by section 7 of this Act, to power, irrigation, mu-
11 nicipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any
12 other purpose authorized under reclamation law. Except as
13 hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act
14 of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports:
15 *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama,
16 Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide,
17 Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa,
18 Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa,
19 Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot
20 Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette
21 participating projects no appropriation for or construction
22 of such participating projects shall be made or begun until
23 coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the
24 affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama
25 and Navajo participating projects shall include the State

1 of Texas), pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1944, and
2 such participating projects shall have been approved and
3 authorized by Act of Congress: *Provided further*, That with
4 reference to the San Juan-Chama project, it shall be
5 limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a
6 tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the
7 control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan
8 River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed,
9 or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam,
10 and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by
11 the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior
12 in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as admin-
13 istered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

14 SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing
15 only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, to
16 limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive
17 developments as will provide for the consumptive use by
18 States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the
19 use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River
20 Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State
21 thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor
22 to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress
23 of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as
24 additional needs are indicated.

25 SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in

1 constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the
2 Colorado River storage project and the participating projects
3 listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be gov-
4 erned by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17,
5 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or sup-
6 plementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) contracts shall
7 be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for
8 the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment
9 of the irrigation obligation assumed thereunder with
10 respect to any project contract unit over a period of not
11 more than fifty years exclusive of any development period
12 authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation
13 distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with
14 an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the
15 Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which
16 has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real
17 property located within its boundaries to assist in making
18 repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the
19 lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) con-
20 tracts relating to municipal water supply may be made
21 without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of
22 section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and
23 (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any
24 participating project, payment of construction costs within
25 the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the

1 Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and partici-
2 pating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of
3 the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of
4 the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper
5 Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper
6 Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the
7 terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty
8 Series 994).

9 SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund
10 in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the
11 Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to
12 as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until
13 expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions
14 of this Act other than section 7.

15 (b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying
16 out the provisions of this Act, other than section 7, shall be
17 credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general
18 fund of the Treasury, and such funds shall be available for
19 expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this
20 Act.

21 (c) All revenues collected in connection with the opera-
22 tion of the Colorado River storage project and participating
23 projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be
24 available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying
25 the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of;

1 and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado
2 River storage project and participating projects, within such
3 separate limitations as may be included in annual appropria-
4 tion acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this
5 section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs
6 of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the
7 water users to repay within the period prescribed in the Act
8 of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made
9 within fifty years after completion of that portion of the
10 project which has not been constructed as of the date of this
11 Act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation fea-
12 tures of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28,
13 1949 (63 Stat. 277) : *Provided*, That revenues credited to
14 the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for
15 construction of the units and participating projects author-
16 ized by or pursuant to this Act. After repayments to the
17 United States of all money required to be repaid under this
18 Act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within
19 the Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized
20 by Congress.

21 (d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating
22 needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the
23 Treasury to return—

24 (1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or
25 any separable feature thereof which are allocated to

1 power pursuant to section 5 of this Act, within a period
2 not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of
3 such unit, participating project, or separable feature
4 thereof;

5 (2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or
6 any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
7 municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this
8 Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the
9 date of completion of such unit, participating project, or
10 separable feature thereof;

11 (3) interest on the unamortized balance of the in-
12 vestment (including interest during construction) in the
13 power and municipal water supply features of each unit,
14 participating project, or any separable feature thereof,
15 at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury
16 as provided in subsection (e); and interest due shall be a
17 first charge; and

18 (4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or
19 any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
20 irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this Act within a
21 period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any de-
22 velopment period authorized by law, from the date of
23 completion of such unit, participating project, or sepa-
24 rable features thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia

1 project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent
2 with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

3 (e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the
4 storage project and each participating project shall be deter-
5 mined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the
6 first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit
7 or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by cal-
8 culating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily
9 closing market bid quotations during the month of June
10 next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made,
11 on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of
12 the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more
13 years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such
14 average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per
15 centum.

16 (f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Con-
17 gress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

18 SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating
19 project or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allo-
20 cate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized
21 by section 7 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or
22 feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood
23 control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under
24 reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and
25 maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes

1 shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. On
2 January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Con-
3 gress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal
4 year 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the
5 cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado
6 River storage project and the participating projects. The
7 Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the
8 Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irri-
9 gation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and re-
10 payment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by
11 year, in accomplishing full repayment.

12 SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission
13 lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and
14 maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction
15 with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as
16 to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and
17 energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but
18 no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or
19 interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colo-
20 rado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Com-
21 pact, or the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

22 SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colo-
23 rado River storage project and of the participating projects,
24 the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan,
25 construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational

1 facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the develop-
2 ment of said project or of said participating projects, to
3 conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic
4 objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for
5 public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas
6 created by these projects by such means as are consistent
7 with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facili-
8 ties to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the
9 propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is author-
10 ized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from
11 entry or other disposition under the public land laws neces-
12 sary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the
13 facilities herein provided for, and to dispose of them to Fed-
14 eral, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, trans-
15 fer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions
16 as will best promote their development and operation in the
17 public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section
18 shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

19 SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed
20 to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in
21 conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project
22 Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjust-
23 ment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the
24 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande

1 Compact of 1938, or the Treaty With the United Mexican
2 States (Treaty Series 994).

3 SEC. 9. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen
4 Canyon, Juniper, Navajo and Echo Park initial units of
5 the Colorado River storage project may be made without
6 regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements
7 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

8 SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
9 such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of
10 this Act.

11 SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States
12 are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver,
13 Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally owned water
14 system, such interests in lands and water rights used or ac-
15 quired by the United States solely for the generation of
16 power and other property of the United States as shall be
17 required in connection with the development or use of its
18 Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such
19 interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by
20 Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so
21 limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than
22 water rights for the necessary functions of the United States
23 Government.

24 SEC. 12. (a) In the operation and maintenance of all

1 facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the juris-
2 diction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in
3 the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the In-
4 terior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions
5 of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River
6 Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder
7 Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the
8 United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water
9 from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event
10 of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply,
11 any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an
12 action in the Supreme Court of the United States, either on
13 its own behalf or as *parens patriae*, to enforce the provisions
14 of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the
15 United States as a party in such suit or suits. No
16 right to impound or use water for the generation of
17 power or energy, created or established by the building,
18 operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by
19 this Act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise
20 operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the
21 date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado
22 River System for domestic or agricultural purposes.

23 (b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for
24 the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River
25 system and in programing the storage and release of such

1 waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time
2 to time with an advisory committee consisting of one repre-
3 sentative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin
4 States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of
5 California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River
6 Commission, and one representative of the United States
7 Section of the International Boundary Commission, United
8 States and Mexico.

9 SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

10 The terms “Colorado River Basin”, “Colorado River
11 Compact”, “Colorado River System”, “Lee Ferry”, “States
12 of the Upper Division”, “Upper Basin”, and “domestic use”
13 shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the
14 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

15 The term “States of the Upper Colorado River Basin”
16 shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico,
17 Utah, and Wyoming;

18 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin” shall have
19 the same meaning as the term “Upper Basin”;

20 The term “Upper Colorado River Basin Compact”
21 shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11,
22 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona,
23 Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented
24 to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act
25 of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31) ;

1 The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that cer-
2 tain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners
3 representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas
4 and consented to by the Congress of the United States of
5 America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785); and

6 The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall
7 mean that certain treaty between the United States of Amer-
8 ica and the United Mexican States signed at Washington,
9 District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the
10 utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other
11 rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated
12 November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the
13 Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting
14 to ratification thereof.

 Passed the Senate April 20 (legislative day, April 18),
1955.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

APRIL 21, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 12, 1955

For actions of July 11, 1955

84th-1st, No. 116

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

* At this season of the year, during the last few weeks of Congress, the Legisla- *
* tive Reporting Staff receives several hundred requests for information and *
* material each day. Usually only three persons are available to fill these re- *
* quests, and they must also prepare the Digest of Congressional Proceedings, *
* which should be issued as early as possible each day. These employees are here *
* to provide good service, and they want to do so. But if your requests can just *
* as well wait until after 11:00 a. m., such scheduling (for either visits or *
* phone calls) will enable us to render better over-all service to the Department. *
* It will also be helpful if you will arrange to consolidate your requests to the *
* extent feasible. *

CONTENTS

Accounting.....44	Grant-in-aid programs...14	REA.....25
Agricultural	Health.....45	Refugee relief.....18,35
conservation payments.14	Hoover Commission....57,62	Reclamation.....8,32,51
Appropriations..1,15,29,65	Immigration.....54	Research.....13,14,21
ARS.....9	Inspection and grading..14	Roads.....5,6,57
CCC sales.....48	Intergovernmental	Rose.....46
Commodity exchanges.....23	relations.....14	Small business.....36
Corporations.....37	Labor.....65,66	Soil conservation.10,14,60
Cotton.....33	Lands.....9,31,59	Storage facilities.....41
County committeemen....52	Legislative program..15,29	Sugar.....61
Dairy industry.....55,65	Livestock loans.....20	Surplus commodities....16
Defense production.....29	Marketing.....12,67	Technical assistance....14
Electrification	Mining.....3	Tobacco.....21
.....8,25,38,50,51	Monopolies.....57,64	Tariffs.....58
Experiment stations.....14	Mutual security.....1	Trade development.....17
FAO.....65	Onions.....23	Traffic management.....43
Farm credit.....15	Organization.....19	Transportation.....43
Farm loans.....28,60,65	Personnel.....7,30	Travel expenses.....2
Feed grain.....11	Prices, farm.....56	Vehicles.....39
Fertilizer.....40	support.....26,60	Water.....4,47,50
Flood control.....10,34	Property.....42	Weather.....24
Foreign aid.....1,53	Purchasing.....68	Wheat.....27
Forestry.3,5,9,13,22,49,59		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to and House received conference report on forest mining bill. Senate passed bills to: extend livestock loans, provide for USDA report on tobacco research program, request USDA report on agricultural weather forecasting, include onions under CEA, and amend Farm Tenant Act. House received conference report on travel expense allowance bill. House passed mutual security appropriation bill.

July 11, 1955

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. Passed with amendment H. R. 7224, the mutual security aid appropriation bill (pp. 8776-8818, 8823). Rejected by a voice vote an amendment offered by Rep. Whitten to prohibit the use of funds for technical assistance programs designed to increase agricultural production of underdeveloped countries; and rejected by a vote of 84 to 146 an amendment offered by Rep. Hand that the United States contribution to international agencies be limited to 33 1/3 % of the budget of such international agency.
The bill provides appropriations of \$2,638,741,750 (\$627,900,000 less than the budget estimates) and a reduction of \$21,366,750 in the estimated unobligated balances, and includes \$150,500,000 for technical assistance programs. The committee report requests that future budget estimates for this program be submitted to Congress earlier in the session. The report also states, "Another matter which seriously concerns the Committee is the evidence of questionable administrative practices followed in obligating, deobligating, and reobligating funds ..." (H. Rept. 1086) (p. 8823).
2. TRAVEL EXPENSES. Received the conference report on H. R. 6295, the per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses allowance (H. Rept. 1088) (pp. 8775-6, 8823). The House conferees receded from their disagreements to the Senate amendments, which provide for a maximum per diem allowance of \$12 and motorcycle mileage allowance of 6 cents and automobile allowance of 10 cents.
3. MINING; FORESTS. Received the conference report on H. R. 5891, providing for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of public lands (H. Rept. 1096) (pp. 8818-9, 8823). The Senate agreed to the conference report (pp. 8713-4).
4. WATER. Conferees were appointed for consideration of H. R. 3990, providing for a study of water resources and potential of Alaska (p. 8818). Senate conferees have not been appointed.
5. ROADS. Received the conference report on S. 1464, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads (H. Rept. 1097) (p. 8819).
6. HIGHWAYS. Rep. Sieminski urged that the tax load on the highway user be considered when methods for financing the Federal aid highway bill are under study (pp. 8819-20, 8822).
7. PERSONNEL. The Rules Committee reported H. Res. 304, which would authorize the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct studies and investigations of various specified matters within their jurisdiction (H. Rept. 1089) (p. 8776).
8. RECLAMATION; ELECTRIFICATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 3383, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project (H. Rept. 1087) (p. 8823).
9. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 1878, to continue availability of certain ARS lands for transfer to Miles City, Mont. (H. Rept. 1091) (p. 8823).

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TOGETHER WITH
MINORITY VIEWS

TO ACCOMPANY

H. R. 3383

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE
INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAIN-
TAIN THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT
AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS, AND FOR OTHER
PURPOSES



Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT,
OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE
PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

JULY 8, 1955.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 3383]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3383

Page 1, lines 4 to 6 inclusive, strike the words:

, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and

Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike the words "and for the improvement of navigation".

Page 2, line 8, following the word "and", insert the word "for". Strike the comma following the word "power".

Page 2, line 9, following the word "purposes," strike the words "hereby authorizes".

Page 2, line 10, following the word "Interior", insert the words "is hereby authorized".

Page 2, line 14, strike the words "Echo Park,". Following the words "Flaming Gorge", insert the words ", Navajo (dam and reservoir only),

Page 3, line 10, following the word "Silt," insert the word "and". Strike the comma following the words "Smith Fork" and insert a period in lieu thereof.

Pages 3, 4 and 5, strike everything beginning on page 3, line 11, through page 5, line 7. Insert in lieu thereof the following new language:

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

Page 5, line 8, renumber "SEC. 3." as "SEC. 4."

Page 6, line 16, renumber "SEC. 4." as "SEC. 5."

Page 6, line 21, strike the numeral "7" following the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "8".

Page 6, line 23, strike the numeral "7" following the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "8".

Page 8, line 2, strike the numeral "5" following the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "6".

Page 8, line 8, strike the numeral "5" following the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "6".

Page 8, line 21, strike the numeral "5" following the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "6".

Page 9, line 20, renumber "SEC. 5." as "SEC. 6."

Page 9, line 23, strike the numeral "7" following the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "8".

Page 10, line 16, renumber "SEC. 6." as "SEC. 7."

Page 11, line 9, renumber "SEC. 7." as "SEC. 8."

Page 12, line 6, renumber "SEC. 8." as "SEC. 9."

Page 12, line 14, renumber "SEC. 9." as "SEC. 10."

Page 12, line 15, strike the words "Echo Park" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Navajo".

Page 12, line 19, renumber "SEC. 10." as "SEC. 11."

Page 12, line 22, renumber "SEC. 11." as "SEC. 12."

Page 12, line 25, strike the figure "\$1,055,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$760,000,000".

Page 12, following line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Interior of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with the city and county of Denver, Colorado, or any other municipality or governmental subdivision in the State of Colorado, on the procedure for and the feasibility of a program which would authorize the said Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colorado, or any other municipality or governmental subdivision in the State of Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power, and such other property of the United States as shall be required in connection with the development or use of such municipal water system. The said Secretary of the Interior shall report his findings and recommendations to the Congress of the United States as soon as possible, but not later than March 1, 1956: *Provided*, That in making his report the said Secretary of the Interior shall recommend a formula governing the charges to be made for any such conveyance.

Page 13, line 1, renumber "SEC. 12." as "SEC. 14."

Page 13, line 13, renumber "SEC. 13." as "SEC. 15."

Page 14, line 3, renumber "SEC. 14." as "SEC. 16."

Page 14, line 10, renumber "SEC. 15." as "SEC. 17."

H. R. 3383 was introduced by Mr. Aspinall. Similar bills were introduced by Messrs. Rogers of Colorado, Dawson of Utah and Fernandez. Twelve days of public hearings on this legislation were held by the committee and 6 days of executive sessions were spent in marking up the bill. Some 68 witnesses were heard, including Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Department officials and officials of the upper Colorado River Basin States. Testimony submitted to the committee during hearings comprises 1,148 pages.

COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSIONS

The committee's conclusions relate only to the units herein recommended for authorization to meet the initial requirement for river regulation and storage and the initial need for participating irrigation projects; and units and participating projects not herein recommended are without prejudice at such time that consideration is given to further needs and requirements.

The committee concludes that the storage units and participating irrigation projects herein recommended for authorization will accomplish the initial requirement in the upper basin for storage for river regulation and will meet the most pressing needs for developing the upper basin's land and water resources. The committee has given consideration to all participating projects on which planning reports have been completed and submitted to Congress.

The committee concludes that the storage units and participating projects herein recommended for authorization together comprise a sound and feasible development from both an engineering and economic standpoint.

The legislative proposals made herein are in general accord with the established policy followed by the Congress in connection with Federal reclamation projects for the last 50 years. In some respects the provisions of this bill are more conservative than established policy. The repayment required under provisions of this bill is designed to insure the concurrent return to the Treasury of expenditures for power, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply purposes. Expendi-

tures for power and municipal and industrial water supply will be returned with interest, including interest during construction. Expenditures for irrigation will be returned without interest in equal annual installments within 50 years after the expiration of any authorized development period. After all project costs have been returned, many millions of dollars of net annual project revenues will continue to flow into the Treasury.

In the interest of achieving, within each of the upper basin States, the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States, the committee concludes that a priority in planning additional consumptive use projects should be given to those projects named in the legislation.

The committee concludes that the authorization of the units and participating irrigation projects included herein will not be detrimental in any respect to the rights of Arizona, California, or Nevada under the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, or the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. The units and projects authorized in the bill are designed only to make effective use of a part of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water apportioned annually to the upper basin.

To assure that the operation of all works on the river adhere to the "law of the river" the committee has included language in section 15, which makes it possible for any Colorado River Basin State to institute litigation promptly in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the event questions arise regarding the legality of the operation of any of the works authorized in the bill or any other works on the river.

The committee considered whether litigation now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States between Arizona and California raises any question affecting the advisability or propriety of the authorization at this time of the works herein recommended. The committee concludes that nothing in such pending litigation warrants delay in authorization of the works proposed in the bill.

The committee recognizes that, as the upper basin States put to beneficial consumptive use more and more of their apportioned water, either by actual use for agricultural or municipal purposes or by storage for future use by exchange, the secondary energy, which has been available from the Hoover powerplant in the past, will be reduced. The committee further recognizes that such reduction in secondary energy will reduce the energy available to southern California, and particularly to Los Angeles—energy which has been exceedingly valuable and which has been purchased at an extremely low rate. However, the committee wishes to emphasize that this energy has been generated by upper basin water which, since it is not being used in the upper basin, has been available to run the turbines at Hoover Dam. It has always been understood that upper basin utilization of water would end this gratuity. This very fact accounts for its classification as secondary or dump power.

The Hoover Dam power contracts are made upon the expressed conditions and with the expressed covenant that the rights of the contractors shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact. The committee concludes, therefore, that the reduction of power available to southern California is a reduction that has been

contemplated and expected since the time of the compact and cannot be considered a factor affecting the propriety of authorization at this time of the works herein recommended. However, the committee understands that during the filling period for Glen Canyon Reservoir, the works will be operated not only in accordance with the compact but in such a way as will cause as little adverse effect as possible upon the power operations at Hoover Dam, considering the expected flow conditions and the expected upper basin consumptive use.

In connection with the measurement of "consumptive use," the evidence showed that the difference in upper basin uses, derived on the one hand from the application of the "diversions-less-returns" method and on the other from the application of the "inflow-outflow" method, cannot be considered a serious factor when the upper basin consumptive use by the storage units and participating projects herein authorized, plus consumptive use by projects existing and under construction, amount to only 3½ million acre-feet annually in comparison with the 7½ million acre-feet apportioned the upper basin. Therefore, the committee concludes that existing differences of opinion as to which method of measuring consumptive use should prevail have no bearing on the consideration of this legislation. The same conclusion is reached in connection with other questions, the answers to which depend on interpretation of the pertinent compacts and Federal laws, treaties with Indian tribes, and the treaty with the United Mexican States. The evidence presented showed that even if all the questions so raised were to be resolved against the upper basin States, the requirements of the storage units and projects authorized by this bill would still not even closely approach the upper basin's legal apportionment.

The committee concludes that the use of holdover storage reservoirs for river regulation was not only contemplated at the time of the Colorado River compact but was understood to be necessary in order for the upper basin to meet its compact commitments to the lower basin. The committee's conclusions in this connection are supported by repeated statements by Hon. Herbert Hoover and other negotiators of the compact, which show beyond doubt that river regulation through storage is implicit in the compact and that article III (c) of the Colorado River compact relates only to arbitrary withholding of water.

With respect to the quality of the water, the committee concludes that the suggestion that the compact requires the upper division States to deliver water of a particular quality is without merit. Nevertheless, the evidence shows that the additional use of water involved in the bill will have no marked effect on the quality of the water delivered to the lower basin. There may, in fact, be some improvement in quality as a result of the development. In this connection, section 16 of the bill requires the Secretary to make a complete study of the effect on the quality of Colorado River water of transmountain diversions and other storage and reclamation projects in the basin. The Secretary must report the results of this study to the Congress and to all the States in the basin.

The committee received testimony from representatives of the private power companies serving the area, from the REA, and from others relating to the rapidly expanding demands in the project area for electric energy. The committee is convinced that there is a

ready market for the electric energy which would be available from the power facilities herein authorized.

With respect to agricultural surpluses, the committee concludes that, in view of the types of crops involved, the long-range nature of the construction program in the upper Colorado River Basin, and the anticipated future demands for agricultural products, there is no basis for the concern that the projects herein authorized will contribute to agricultural surpluses.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This legislation would permit orderly development of the land and water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin. First, the legislation would authorize a series of holdover storage reservoirs with hydroelectric plants and incidental works. Second, it would authorize a number of irrigation projects. Third, it would authorize priority in planning for a number of additional irrigation projects. The legislation recognizes that the units and projects authorized and the additional projects named for planning constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive plan for development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin and that the legislation is not intended to limit or preclude, in the future, as additional needs are indicated, authorization by the Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned to the upper basin States under the Colorado River compact.

BACKGROUND

The comprehensive basin plan for developing the land and water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin is the direct result of many years of thorough investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the States of the upper basin and with other Federal agencies and departments of Government. The necessity for and the foundation of the overall plan of development of the water resources of the upper basin is to be found in the historical, geographical, physical, climatic, and economic conditions peculiar to that region. The Colorado River is an erratic stream. The periods of high flow do not coincide with the periods of greatest demand on its waters. Large holdover reservoirs, like Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam which stores and regulates water for use in the lower basin, are needed in the upper basin for storing water during years of high flow for use during subsequent years of low stream discharges, as well as to serve on a seasonal basis. By these large storage reservoirs the flows of the river can be equated from year to year and the maximum amount of water utilization can be accomplished on a long-term basis.

The Colorado River compact of 1922 divides the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the upper basin, comprising those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—

within which and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system above Lee Ferry (Colorado River compact, art. II (f))—

and the lower basin, comprising—

those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system

below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system below Lee Ferry (Colorado River compact, art. II (g)).

Article III (a) of the compact apportions to each basin in perpetuity—

the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum * * *.

Article III (d) of the compact provides that the—

States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years * * *.

The Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) became effective in 1929 upon ratification of the compact by all States other than Arizona, the enactment of the California Limitation Act, and proclamation by the President.

The upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948 apportions among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming the consumptive use of waters apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact of 1922.

After the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act became effective, lower basin development proceeded at a rapid pace with construction of the Hoover Dam and the Boulder Canyon project, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, and other works. Large populations in cities such as Los Angeles and San Diego, and extensive agricultural areas served by the Imperial Irrigation District, the Palo Verde District, and others have created expanding uses of the waters of the Colorado River for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes.

Development in the upper basin States of the water resources apportioned to that area by the original compact has been retarded while a comprehensive plan for the most efficient use of the upper basin's share of the water has been in preparation, while the investigation and selection of the best dam sites has been underway, and while engineering and economic problems have been considered. Completion of the upper Colorado River Basin compact in 1948 has permitted the formulation of the comprehensive basin plan mentioned above whereby the upper basin States could eventually use all the water of the Colorado River system allotted to them. Under this plan, sufficient hold-over storage capacity would be provided in the upper basin to enable it to meet its commitment to the lower basin required by the Colorado River compact of 1922 and at the same time permit the upper basin States to make full use of their apportioned share of the water.

The upper basin comprises an area of some 110,000 square miles. On its fringes lie such large centers of population as Denver, Salt Lake City, and Albuquerque, each of which has experienced rapid growth in recent years and each of which anticipates additional significant growth, with an ever-increasing and urgent need for water and power. Growth within the basin itself has been rapid during recent years. The upper basin proper has been primarily an agricultural area; however, it contains valuable mineral resources which are becoming more important to our national welfare and economy. The mineral resources in the upper basin include uranium, vanadium, iron, coal,

oil, oil shale, phosphates, and other metals and minerals. Intensified development of mineral resources and other industrial expansion in the area in recent years, and the increased population as a result thereof, have taxed to the extreme the municipal and industrial water supply facilities in many localities. The demand for municipal and industrial water in the project area is increasing rapidly. The Colorado River is the last water resource available in many parts of the area to supply additional water for municipal and industrial purposes. The future growth and development of the municipalities and their industries is therefore dependent to a large extent upon this comprehensive basin plan. The area stands on the verge of great industrial growth, with consequent increase in need for water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes as well as for power.

Testimony given to the committee by representatives of all the upper Colorado River Basin States left no doubt that the future of those States is dependent upon the plan which would be initiated by this legislation or one similar thereto. This plan would make possible the utilization of the area's abundant natural resources and enrich the economy of the area and the Nation. Without it, development of these resources will be hampered and growth will be slow.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

The initial phase of the comprehensive plan to develop the land and water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, both in terms of storage units and irrigation projects, would be authorized by this legislation. The storage provided with the consequent river regulation would permit the development of irrigation projects to go forward in an orderly manner. The initial irrigation projects would result in the irrigation of about 132,000 acres of new land and a supplemental water supply for an additional 234,000 acres, as indicated in table 1. A great new source of hydroelectric power would be provided to meet the need of the expanding economy of the area. In conjunction with the reclamation projects, municipal and industrial water would be furnished to many towns and cities. In addition, the plan would create new recreational facilities and substantial benefits to fish and wildlife.

The storage units which would be authorized are Flaming Gorge, Navajo, and Glen Canyon. In addition, the Curecanti unit would be authorized subject to a finding of feasibility and report to Congress. The irrigation projects, referred to as participating projects, which would be authorized are: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork. A brief description of these storage units and participating projects follows:

STORAGE UNITS

Curecanti (modified plan)

The Curecanti unit would consist of a reservoir on the Gunnison River formed by the Blue Mesa Dam below the town of Gunnison, Colo., and of three downstream reservoirs respectively referred to as the Narrow Gauge, Morrow Point, and Crystal Reservoirs. The bill limits the water-surface elevation of the reservoir formed by Blue Mesa Dam to 7,520 feet. At this water-surface elevation, the ca-

capacity of the reservoir is estimated at 940,000 acre-feet. The three downstream reservoirs would be primarily for the development of power head with only nominal active storage capacities. Sufficient active capacity would be provided at the Morrow Point site for some seasonal regulation of stream inflows below Blue Mesa Dam.

Flaming Gorge

The principal feature of the Flaming Gorge unit is the dam, which will be located on the Green River in Utah, about 32 miles north of Vernal, and which would be a concrete, gravity-type structure rising 440 feet above the river. Flaming Gorge Reservoir formed by the dam would have a total capacity of 3,940,000 acre-feet. The powerplant at the dam would have a capacity of 72,000 kilowatts.

Navajo

The Navajo Dam would be located on the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico about 34 miles east of the town of Farmington. The dam would be a rolled, earth-filled embankment rising 335 feet above streambed. Navajo Reservoir would have a total capacity of 1,450,000 acre-feet. The dam and reservoir will provide for gravity diversion for white and Indian lands to be irrigated under the Navajo project. Also, in connection with the San Juan-Chama project, the reservoir would constitute a source of supply for downstream irrigation users in exchange for natural flow diverted upstream.

Glen Canyon

The Glen Canyon Dam would be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 15 miles upstream from Lee Ferry—the division point between the lower and upper basins. It would be a concrete, curved, gravity-type structure rising 700 feet above bedrock. The reservoir, with a total capacity of 26 million acre-feet, would provide final regulation for deliveries to the lower basin under the Colorado River compact. The powerplant would be located near the toe of the dam. It would have a total installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts.

PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Central Utah

The Central Utah project (initial phase) is located in the eastern Bonneville Basin in central Utah and in the Uinta Basin, part of the Colorado River Basin in northeastern Utah. The plan would include construction of the Strawberry aqueduct along the south slope of the Uinta Mountains for intercepting Uinta Basin streams as far east as Rock Creek, enlargement of the Strawberry Reservoir by construction of the Soldier Creek Dam, enlargement of the Strawberry Reservoir outlet tunnel, construction of 5 powerplants with a combined generating capacity of 61,000 kilowatts, and construction of a number of other reservoirs for regulation, storage, and water exchanges. The Wasatch aqueduct, canals, and distribution system would be constructed as necessary to deliver and utilize the increased water supply. Drainage would be provided where necessary. The project would irrigate about 28,540 acres of new land. It would also supply supplemental water for about 131,840 acres and furnish 48,800 acre-feet of municipal water.

Emery County

The Emery County project is located in east-central Utah along the San Rafael River. The project works would include a dam and reservoir, a diversion dam, a canal, and laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 3,630 acres of new land and furnish supplemental water for about 20,450 acres.

Florida

The Florida project is in southwestern Colorado, in the Florida River Valley. Project works would include a dam and reservoir, a diversion dam, enlargement and extension of existing canal, and distribution laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 6,300 acres of new land and furnish supplemental water to about 12,650 acres.

Hammond

The Hammond project is in northwestern New Mexico along the San Juan River. The project works would include a diversion dam, a canal, and distribution laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 3,670 acres of new land.

LaBarge

The LaBarge project is in southwestern Wyoming in the upper end of the Colorado River Basin. It extends approximately 40 miles along the west side of Green River. Project works would include a diversion dam, a conveyance canal, and distribution laterals. About 7,970 acres of new land would be irrigated by this project.

Lyman

The Lyman project is in southwestern Wyoming, just above the Utah-Wyoming State line. It lies along Blacks Fork, a tributary of the Green River. Project works include a reservoir, conveyance canals, and drainage facilities. Supplemental water would be furnished to about 40,600 acres.

Paonia

The Paonia project is located in west-central Colorado on the North Fork of the Gunnison River. This project has been previously authorized and is partially constructed. It would, however, be extended by this reauthorization. The project works include a dam and reservoir, canals, and siphon. As reauthorized, the area to be served would include 17,040 acres, of which 2,210 would be new land and 14,830 acres would be furnished supplemental water.

Pine River extension

The Pine River extension is in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico, on Pine River, 20 miles east of Durango, Colo. The project works include a diversion dam, the enlargement and extension of canals, and a number of distribution laterals. The project would irrigate about 15,150 acres of new land. Storage water is to be obtained from existing Valleeito Dam and Reservoir on Pine River.

Seedskadee

The Seedskadee project is in southwestern Wyoming along the Green River below the LaBarge project. Project works would include a diversion dam, conveyance canals, and distribution laterals. About 60,720 acres of new land would be irrigated by the project.

Silt

The Silt project is located in west-central Colorado between Rifle and Elk Creeks. The project works include a dam, and reservoir pumping system, rehabilitation of existing canal, and construction of some new laterals and drains. The project would irrigate about 1,900 acres of new land and would furnish supplemental water for about 5,400 acres.

Smith Fork

The Smith Fork project is located in west-central Colorado along Smith Fork, a tributary of the Gunnison River. The project works would include a dam and reservoir, diversion dam, canals, and laterals. The project would irrigate about 2,270 acres of new land and furnish supplemental water for about 8,160 acres.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS

The plan for the Colorado River storage project and participating projects is financially sound. It has been subjected to the most rigid economic and financial requirements. The construction costs, the cost allocations, and the repayment data for the units and participating projects recommended for authorization in the bill are summarized in table 1. The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$760 million. This compares with \$950 million recommended by the administration. By letter dated June 21, 1955, Acting Secretary of the Treasury Burgess advised the Committee Chairman as follows:

The President has of course recommended legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project. Details worked out by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior, however, contemplated an authorization limited to units requiring expenditures of \$950 million, whereas S. 500 contemplates units calling for expenditures amounting to over \$1,650 million.

While we realize that in time the initial units added to the proposal by the Senate may be justified, and that the participating projects added to the proposal by the Senate would not be begun until the Secretary of the Interior has reexamined their economic justification and had certified to the Congress that the benefits of each project would exceed the cost, we feel that it is highly desirable to limit the authorization to the \$950 million proposed by the administration. In view of the importance of bringing the budget into balance, the Congress should retain the greatest measure of control over authorizations for new expenditures, and by limiting the present proposal to units presently justified the Congress will be in a position to review the program as it develops.

The total construction cost of the initial units and participating projects recommended for authorization is estimated by the Department at \$901.7 million. This includes about \$7.3 million for the authorized Eden project now nearing completion and about \$2 million already expended on the Paonia project under a previous authorization. This cost also includes a transmission system necessary to deliver electrical energy to power market centers. If arrangements are worked out between the Department and the private utilities serving the area whereby the Federal Government constructs only the interconnecting trunkline and the remainder of the system is constructed by the private utilities, the construction cost would be considerably reduced as would the purchase price for the project power and energy.

Only about \$8.2 million, or less than 1 percent, of the total cost is nonreimbursable for flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation. The remainder of over 99 percent is allocated to irrigation, power, and

municipal water supply as follows: \$331.6 million to irrigation, \$510.9 million to power, and \$45.5 million to municipal water supply.

The committee reduced by 10 percent the above construction cost estimates and cost allocations of the Department in establishing the amount authorized to be appropriated. Testimony given the committee indicates that there has been some reduction in price levels applicable to the type of construction herein involved and that recent bids from contractors have consistently been below the engineers' estimates. This testimony, plus evidence that the amount included in the Department's estimates for overhead and contingencies is high, contributed to this action by the committee reducing the Department's estimated costs by 10 percent. The committee has not included funds for construction of the Curecanti unit as the Department is presently studying a modified plan for this unit and a report demonstrating its feasibility must be submitted to the Congress. It is the committee's view that funds should be authorized at the time the report is submitted to the Congress. The funds for the construction of the Eden project have previously been authorized to be appropriated and therefore no funds for the Eden project are included. Also, the amount previously authorized and expended on the Paonia project is not included. The committee included funds for units and projects totaling \$758.8 million, as shown in table 1. The figure was rounded to \$760 million in establishing the amount authorized to be appropriated.

The entire amount for power and municipal water supply of about \$463.7 million, on the basis of the committee's figures, would be returned to the United States Treasury with interest not only on the investment but also with interest accruing during the construction period. While the amount for irrigation in the bill of about \$282.8 million does not bear interest, pursuant to the 50-year-old principle of reclamation law, this amount would be returned, under the provisions of the bill, in equal annual installments in 50 years plus any development period authorized. In recognition of the many indirect benefits that accrue to those living in the vicinity or on the irrigation projects, the indirect beneficiaries in the immediate area would aid in the repayment of irrigation costs through an ad valorem tax.

In a 50-year period following the last power installation, net power revenues from the power facilities herein authorized are estimated at \$1,075 million. Irrigation revenues in 50 years from the irrigation projects herein authorized are estimated at \$36.6 million. The \$1,075 million from power revenues would be sufficient to pay the power investment of \$422.7 million, interest on the power investment of about \$320 million to the Federal Treasury, the necessary financial assistance to irrigation of \$246.2 million (\$282.8 million minus \$36.6 million) and leave a surplus at the end of the period of about \$86 million. Municipal water revenues would be sufficient to repay the municipal water allocation with interest including interest during construction.

After the project has been completely repaid, the net power revenues amounting to from \$15 million to \$20 million annually for the units herein authorized will continue to flow into the Treasury. Over the long run, these additional revenues will more than offset the cost to the Federal Government resulting from interest-free financing for the irrigation investment. Thus, it is evident that the repayment plan is sound and that repayment is in accordance with the normal pro-

cedure for reclamation projects. It appears that the returns from the units herein authorized would, in the long run, be an asset purely from a financial standpoint, to say nothing of the tremendous returns to the economic well-being of the Nation in terms of increased wealth, broadened tax base, new farms and homes, etc. In this connection, the Hoover Commission, in its recent report on water resources and power, made this comment:

The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crops, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

The average project cost per acre for the lands to be irrigated ranges from \$190 per acre to \$715 per acre. These per-acre costs are not unusually high for reclamation projects being planned today. The good projects, from the standpoint of cost, have been constructed. The justification for these per-acre expenditures lies in the returns from the development over the years and not on the market value of the land after it is irrigated. Although there is a relationship between the direct benefits resulting from irrigation and the increased value of the land, this cannot be used as a measure of project justification. Project justification is measured by comparing, over the economic life, the increased annual benefits or effects, direct and indirect, resulting from construction of the projects with the annual cost of such construction. All the participating irrigation projects herein recommended are justified on this basis. To speak in terms of cost without considering the resulting returns is meaningless. For instance, the Central Utah project, which has a per-acre cost almost 4 times as high as the LaBarge project, has about the same benefit-cost ratio.

TABLE 1.—Summary of units of Colorado River storage project and participating projects authorized by the bill

Project and State	Lands to be irrigated		Generating capacity	Municipal water annually	Stream depletion annually	Construction costs				Repayment of reimbursable costs			Funds authorized to be appropriated ¹
	New	Supplemental				Total	Nonreimbursable	Reimbursable allocations		By water users	By initial power units (Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, central Utah)	Total	
								Power	Municipal water				
Colorado River storage project initial units:													
Glen Canyon unit, Arizona, Utah	Acres	Acres	Kilowatts	Acres	Acres	\$421,270,000		\$370,974,000			\$421,270,000	\$421,270,000	\$379,143,000
Flaming Gorge, Utah-Wyoming			72,000		56,000	82,942,000		52,042,000			82,942,000	82,942,000	74,648,000
Navajo, N. Mex					16,000	36,592,000	\$1,298,000				35,294,000	35,294,000	32,933,000
Subtotal			872,000		598,000	540,804,000	1,298,000	423,016,000			539,506,000	539,506,000	486,724,000
Additional storage unit contingent upon finding of feasibility and report: Cienega unit ²					18,000								(2)
11 participating projects:													
LaBarge, Wyo	7,970				14,200	1,673,300				\$495,000	1,178,300	1,673,300	1,506,000
Seedskadee, Wyo	60,720				110,400	23,272,000				4,785,000	18,487,000	23,272,000	20,944,800
Lyman, Wyo	40,600					10,564,000				2,255,000	8,309,000	10,564,000	9,507,600
Silt, Colo	1,900	5,400			5,800	3,356,000	73,600			1,020,000	2,262,400	3,282,400	3,020,400
Smith Fork, Colo	2,270	8,100			7,300	3,367,000	24,000			1,045,000	2,268,000	3,343,000	3,030,300
Paonia, Colo	2,210	14,830			9,000	6,944,000	152,400			2,414,000	4,377,600	6,791,600	3,418,100
Florida, Colo	6,300	12,650			12,900	6,941,500	437,900			1,711,500	4,792,100	6,503,600	6,247,400
Pine River project extension, Colorado, New Mexico	15,150				28,300	5,027,000				2,045,000	2,982,000	5,027,000	4,524,300
Emery County, Utah	3,630	20,430			15,500	9,865,500	229,000			6,715,000	5,921,500	9,636,500	8,879,000
Central Utah (initial phase), Utah	28,540	131,840			189,400	231,044,000	5,991,000	46,699,000	\$45,500,000	158,862,000	219,553,000	219,553,000	207,939,600
Hammond, N. Mex	3,670				7,900	2,302,000				370,000	1,932,000	2,302,000	2,071,800
Subtotal, 11 initial projects	132,360	233,930	61,000	48,800	400,900	304,356,300	6,907,900	46,699,000	45,500,000	80,546,500	211,401,900	291,948,400	272,089,300

Additional participating project authorized and under construction, Eden, Wyo.....	10,660	9,540			32,400	7,287,000			7,287,000	5,787,000	7,287,000	(6)
Total, 12 participating projects.....	143,020	243,470	61,000	48,800	433,300	311,043,300	6,907,900	46,699,000	207,036,400	217,188,900	299,235,400	272,089,300
Grand total.....	143,020	243,470	933,000	48,800	1,049,300	852,447,300	8,205,900	7469,715,000	8323,526,400	756,694,900	838,741,400	758,813,300

¹ The Department's estimates have been reduced by 10 percent. Testimony indicates that there has been a reduction in price levels applicable to the type of construction here involved and that recent bids from contractors have consistently been below the estimates. Also, there is evidence that the amount included in the Department's estimates for overhead and contingencies is high.

² The committee did not include funds for the Curecanti unit as Department is presently studying modified plan, a report on which must be submitted to the Congress. Firm data on unit not available.

³ The amount of \$2,035,000 previously authorized and expended has been deducted from estimated cost.

⁴ Includes \$15,191,000 in irrigation revenues and \$45,500,000 from municipal and industrial water users.

⁵ Exclusive of \$5,500,000 allocable to purposes of the ultimate phase of central Utah project.

⁶ Included in the bill for obtaining financial assistance only. No authorization of funds required.

⁷ Allocations to power and municipal water as reduced by committee (see footnote 9) are repaid with interest including interest during construction.

⁸ Allocation to irrigation as reduced by committee (see footnote 9) is repaid in equal annual installments in 50 years plus any development period authorized, except for Paonia and Eden, which are covered by existing law.

⁹ Includes about \$282.8 million for irrigation, \$422.7 million for power, \$41 million for municipal water, \$7.4 million nonreimbursable, and \$4.9 million allocable to purposes of the ultimate phase of the central Utah project.

RELATIONSHIP OF PROJECT TO AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

One argument that has been made against the Colorado River storage project and participating projects is that, in view of present farm surpluses, it would be unwise to bring additional lands into production at this time. For the most part the crops which would be produced on the irrigation projects in the upper Colorado Basin are either not in the surplus category or they are for local feeding of livestock, and therefore they do not contribute to farm surpluses. Also, the construction of these irrigation projects is a long-range program and this must be kept in mind if the projects are considered in terms of their relationship to the problem of farm surpluses.

This problem of unbalanced agricultural production or surpluses is one of the least understood problems now facing the United States. Most people do not understand that the existing unbalanced situation is of short duration and that in a matter of a very few years demands will overcome surpluses. In this connection, we should keep several pertinent facts in mind. The population of the United States is around 162 million and is increasing at a rate of nearly 3 million per year. Most authorities agree that by 1975 our population will be above 200 million persons with some estimates running as high as 220 million. If we continue our present diet, and it is expected to improve, we will need an equivalent of production from an additional 6 to 7½ million acres each year, and by 1975 we will need at least 20 to 30 million acres of new cropland, allowing for a continuing increase in crop yields per acre as a result of improved farming methods and research. While our demands are thus increasing rapidly, we are losing about 1.4 million acres a year through use of land for highways, airports, reservoirs, expanding cities, soil erosion and other nonproductive activities. Keeping these facts in mind, it may be expected that agricultural production may be brought in balance in a very few years and we must adopt vigorous measures if serious shortages are to be avoided.

In view of the types of crops involved, the long-range nature of the construction program in the upper Colorado River Basin, and the anticipated future demands for agricultural products, the committee concludes there is no basis for the concern that the projects herein recommended will contribute to agricultural surpluses.

PROPOSAL OF THE PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES

The committee finds that this project is unique in that there is no public versus private power controversy involved. Representatives of the 10 private power companies operating in the area presented testimony before the committee indicating their desire to cooperate with the Federal Government in the transmission and marketing of electric power and energy from the Colorado River storage project. Their proposal provides essentially that the Secretary construct the backbone transmission lines connecting major powerplants of the project and that use be made of the existing systems of the companies and additions thereto to market the power. The companies assured the committee of their willingness to serve preference customers either through wheeling or through resales with appropriate safeguards to protect the rights and interests of the preference customers, and of the

desire of the private utilities of the area to purchase power in excess of that taken by preference customers.

The proposal by the power companies seemed entirely reasonable to the committee. The proposal is consistent with the policy expressed by the Congress for many years in appropriation acts and elsewhere whereby the Federal Government builds the basic backbone transmission system and distribution is made through existing systems where satisfactory arrangements can be worked out. The procedure proposed is similar to that which has worked very satisfactorily for the Central Valley project.

The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private power companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 1 of the bill sets out the purpose of the legislation and the units and projects which would be authorized for construction. With respect to the Curecanti storage unit, the water surface is limited to a certain elevation and construction is contingent upon certification by the Secretary to the Congress and to the President as to its economic justification.

Section 2 lists by name additional participating projects which shall be given priority in planning by the Secretary.

Section 3 recognizes that the units authorized and the additional projects named for planning constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive plan and that the legislation is not intended to limit or preclude additional authorizations of other projects in the future.

Section 4 requires that the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works authorized be in accordance with Federal reclamation laws except as otherwise provided in the bill. Existing reclamation laws are supplemented for this project in a proviso (a) requiring that irrigation repayment contracts, except as provided in other legislation for the Paonia and Eden projects, not exceed 50 years, exclusive of development period; (b) requiring that irrigation repayment contracts be made with a conservancy type irrigation district prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, except where a substantial portion of the lands are owned by the United States, in which cases the delivery of water rather than the construction will be contingent upon the completion of contract; (c) making inapplicable that part of reclamation law which appears to give irrigation water priority over municipal water, and thus making this legislation consistent with most State constitutions which give preference to the use of water for domestic purposes; and (d) making the payment of construction costs (which are within the capability of the land to repay) covering Indian lands subject to the Leavitt Act.

Section 5 authorizes a separate fund for the project and explains the operation of the fund. The fund would be credited with all appropriations for the project and all revenues collected from the project. Revenues in excess of operating needs would be paid annually to the Federal Treasury to (a) return with interest the cost of each unit, participating project or any separable feature thereof, which are allocated to commercial power or to municipal water supply within a period not exceeding 50 years, in the case of municipal water features, and within a period not exceeding the economic life, in the case of power features; (b) return without interest in equal annual installments the cost of each unit, participating project or separable feature allocated to irrigation within a period not exceeding 50 years exclusive of development period, except in the cases of the Paonia project and of the Indian lands in which cases the repayment period would be consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto. The interest rate would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time appropriation is made for initiating construction. The formula for determining the rate is designed to give a rate approximately equal to the cost of money to the United States on its long-term public debt obligations. This section also requires that business type budgets be submitted to the Congress annually covering all operations financed by the basin fund.

Section 6 requires that the Secretary make an allocation of cost for each unit or project upon its completion and submit a report to the Congress each fiscal year upon the status of revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

Section 7 provides that the hydroelectric powerplants be operated so as to produce the greatest amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates without, however, impairing the use of water for domestic or agricultural purposes and without affecting or interfering with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act or the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. All Colorado River Basin States are on the same basis with respect to acquiring electric power and energy from the project.

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to plan, construct, and operate public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of the project and facilities to mitigate the losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire or to withdraw lands necessary for the construction and operation of these recreational and fish facilities and to dispose of the lands to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies upon conditions which will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes would be nonreimbursable under the provisions of this section.

Section 9 simply provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provisions of the compacts and acts which comprise the so-called law of the river.

Section 10 provides that expenditures for units of the storage project may be made without regard to the requirement of the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1954, which is now permanent

legislation and which provides that there be no expenditure for initiation of construction of any dam or reservoir or other works related thereto until the Secretary of the Interior has certified to the Congress that an adequate soil survey and land classification have been made and the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, or that the successful irrigability of these lands and their susceptibility to sustained production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation has been demonstrated in practice. The application of the certification requirement to the storage units would be impossible of accomplishment. By regulation of the flows of the rivers, these storage reservoirs benefit all the lands of the upper basin including those to be irrigated in the future. The requirement that each of the participating projects comply with the certification requirement meets the objective of this provision in law which objective is to prevent construction of irrigation works prior to assurance that they can be used.

Section 11 expresses the sense of the Congress that the construction of the projects authorized should proceed as rapidly as would be consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the Nation.

Section 12 authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Section 13 directs the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the city and county of Denver, Colo., or any other municipality or legal subdivision of the State of Colorado, with respect to conveyance to such municipalities of water rights and other Federal property acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power.

Section 14 requires that the Secretary, in planning additional developments in the upper basin, give consideration to achievement within each of the upper basin States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters apportioned each State.

Section 15 directs the Secretary of the Interior to operate the facilities authorized in the bill in compliance with the compacts and acts which comprise the so-called law of the river, and permits any State of the Colorado River Basin, in the event the Secretary fails to so comply, to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States and gives consent to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit.

Section 16 directs the Secretary of the Interior to undertake studies and make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin upon the effect on the quality of Colorado River water of all transmountain diversions and all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

Section 17 defines certain terms used in the legislation.

DEPARTMENTS' REPORTS

The project planning report of the Department of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects has been transmitted to the Congress and is set forth in House Document 364, 83d Congress. This report includes the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the views and recommendations of the Colorado River Basin States, other interested Federal agencies, and the Bureau of the Budget. The report of the Department of the Interior on the legislation follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., March 8, 1955.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: A report has been requested from this Department on H. R. 3383, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. You have also requested that we comment on H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, and H. R. 3384 to the extent to which they differ from H. R. 3383.

In his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower said (H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., p. 8):

"* * * the Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Likewise in his budget message (H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., p. M65) the President said:

"I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments."

In the budget itself it was pointed out (p. 830) that the administration proposes to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project during the next fiscal year if it is authorized and that the budget includes an item for funds to be requested for this purpose.

The substance of our views on the proper contents of a bill to implement the President's recommendation and particularly on those projects and units which should be covered in the initial legislation is contained in the draft of bill which was developed by the Bureau of the Budget in collaboration with this Department and submitted to your committee on April 1, 1954, in connection with H. R. 4449, 83d Congress, a predecessor of the present H. R. 3383.

We recommend that H. R. 3383 be examined in the light of the proposal there made and in the light of the two letters dated March 18, 1954, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to this Department which are reprinted in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, and that, with suitable amendments, H. R. 3383 be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the above report to your committee. That office, however, has not yet had an opportunity to consider the attached comparative analysis of H. R. 3383, H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, and H. R. 3384. The comments made therein must not, for this reason, be regarded as representing any commitment with respect to their conformity to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H. R. 3383, H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, AND H. R. 3384,
84TH CONGRESS

Storage project units named

H. R. 3383: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon.

H. R. 270: Adds Cross Mountain and Navajo to above.

H. R. 2836: Same as H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Adds Juniper and Navajo to those covered in H. R. 3383.

Comment: The Department of the Interior recommends that only Glen Canyon and Echo Park be authorized as storage units at this time.

Participating projects named

H. R. 3383: Central Utah (initial phase), Emory County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (new works), Pine River extension, Seedska-dee, Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navajo.

H. R. 270: Adds Gooseberry to above.

H. R. 2836: Same as H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Adds Gooseberry, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savory-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Elkhorn, Kendall to those named in H. R. 3383.

Comment: Department of the Interior recommends that the projects covered be limited to the 11 listed in the administration bill submitted to the committee on April 1, 1954, viz, central Utah (initial phase), Emory County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (new works), Pine River extension, Seedska-dee, Silt, and Smith Fork.

Extent of authorization

H. R. 3383: Echo Park, Glen Canyon, and Flaming Gorge fully authorized; Curecanti subject to certification, on basis of further engineering and economic investigations, that its benefits will exceed its costs. All participating projects except San Juan-Chama and Navajo fully authorized; San Juan-Chama and Navajo subject to submission of coordinated reports to States under Flood Control Act of 1944 and to approval of and authorization by the Congress.

H. R. 270: Same as H. R. 3383 for storage units. All participating projects subject to reexamination by Secretary of the Interior with respect to their economic justification and to certification by him that their benefits will exceed their costs and that they meet reimbursement requirements of bill. Estimates of direct agricultural benefits to be made after consultation with Secretary of Agriculture. Provisions with respect to San Juan-Chama and Navajo substantially same as in H. R. 3383.

H. R. 2836: Virtually identical with H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Same as H. R. 3383 for storage units. Virtually the same as H. R. 270 for participating projects named in that bill but with respect to the other participating projects not named therein requires submission of planning reports to States under Flood Control Act of 1944 and authorization by Congress.

Comment: The administration bill submitted to the committee on April 1, 1954, provided that authority to construct the participating projects named in it should not become effective until the Secretary of the Interior had reexamined their economic justification (his appraisal of the direct agricultural benefits to be made in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture) and had certified to the Congress that their benefits exceeded their costs. We adhere to the principles of the bill and, as has been said before, to the list of projects named therein. As among the four bills now before the committee, we prefer the provisions of H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, and H. R. 3384 with respect to actions to be taken prior to construction of participating projects to those of H. R. 3383 on this point.

Repayment

H. R. 3383: Irrigation allocations to be returned to Treasury in equal annual installments over a period of not more than 50 years (exclusive of development period) from completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof. Municipal water allocation to be returned to Treasury with interest over a period of not more than 50 years from completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof. Commercial power allocation to be returned to Treasury with interest over expected economic life of unit, participating project, or separable feature or within 100 years, whichever is shorter.

H. R. 270: Irrigation, municipal water, and commercial power allocations—the latter two with interest—to be returned to the Treasury within not more than 50 years plus, in the case of irrigation, a development period.

H. R. 2836: Same as H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Same as H. R. 270.

Comment: The provisions of H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, and H. R. 3384 are, in this respect, like those of the administration bill of April 1, 1954. We adhere to these provisions and recommend that they be substituted for those of H. R. 3383.

Operation of powerplants

H. R. 3383: After providing for operation of the powerplants covered by the bill in conjunction with other Federal power facilities, the bill provides that no

exercise of that authority "shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said Acts without the consent of the other contracting parties."

H. R. 270: Same as H. R. 3383 but omits express reference to contracts.

H. R. 2836: Same as H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Same as H. R. 270.

Comment: The language of H. R. 3383 with respect to contracts appears to be superfluous but is otherwise unobjectionable.

Appropriability of water used for power purposes

H. R. 3383: Provides that "Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin."

H. R. 270: Omits the above.

H. R. 2836: Has provision similar to that of H. R. 270, but extends to all power-plants authorized by bill.

H. R. 3384: Same as H. R. 2836.

Comment: The provisions of H. R. 3383 are in this respect identical with those of the administration bill and are recommended for inclusion in the legislation. Unless a great deal of excess storage capacity beyond that provided by Glen Canyon and Echo Park is authorized and constructed, the waters impounded in these reservoirs will, within a comparatively few years, be devoted almost entirely to fulfilling the obligations of the upper division States with respect to deliveries at Lee Ferry for lower basin and Mexican treaty purposes. The generation of power will be a byproduct of release for these purposes. Pay-out studies have been based upon the assumption that the upper basin depletion of the stream contemplated by this provision will occur in any event.

Soil survey and land classification exemption

H. R. 3383: Exemption applicable to four storage project units covered in bill.

H. R. 270: Exemption applicable to five storage projects units covered in bill; not applicable to Curecanti.

H. R. 2836: Same as H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Exemption applicable to four storage project units covered in bill; not applicable to Curecanti, Juniper, and Navajo.

Comment: It is believed that the exemption should be commensurate with whatever storage project units are ultimately covered by the bill.

Authorized appropriations

H. R. 3383: Limits authorized appropriations to \$1,055 million.

H. R. 270: Omits limitation.

H. R. 2836: Omits limitation.

H. R. 3384: Omits limitation.

Comment: The Department of the Interior would have no objection in this case to specifying the amount authorized to be appropriated. If such a limitation is spelled out in the bill, as it is in H. R. 3383, the text should make clear, as that of H. R. 3383 does not, that the sum specified is for construction costs only and is not inclusive of initial operation and maintenance costs.

Future planning

H. R. 3383: Section 12 of this bill provides that "In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States."

H. R. 270: Omits above.

H. R. 2836: Omits above.

H. R. 3384: Omits above.

Comment: The Interior Department has no objection to the inclusion of the provision of H. R. 3383 quoted above. It would, in any event, seek to achieve

the end specified. If this provision is included, however, it suggests that Arizona be added to the other States named in the bill since it is an upper basin State and is apportioned a small quantity of upper basin water by the upper Colorado River Basin compact.

Litigation and consultation

H. R. 3383: Provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs under his jurisdiction anywhere in the Colorado River Basin, "comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States." Provides further that, in the event of his failure so to comply "any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section" and gives the consent of the United States to its joinder as a party in any such suit.

H. R. 270: Directs compliance with the applicable provisions of the documents referred to above in the operation and maintenance of all Federal facilities in the Colorado River Basin under his jurisdiction. Provides further for consultation with an "integrating committee consisting of one representative from each of the Colorado River Basin States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and one representative of the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico" on the storage and release of waters from works under his jurisdiction.

H. R. 2836: Similar to H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Includes provisions similar both to those in H. R. 3383 and to those in H. R. 270.

Comment: (a) Unless extraordinary circumstances so require, it would seem unwise to single out the Colorado River for special treatment with respect to litigation. Moreover, assuming that the Secretary will be directed (as all of the bills provide in various places) to comply with the Colorado River compact and related documents, there is no apparent reason for the waiver of the immunity of the United States from suit in the Supreme Court. There is ample in the other parts of the bills, we believe, on which to found an action against the Secretary alone in case he exceeds the authority given him under their terms. But if it is the desire of the committee to include such a provision as that contained in H. R. 3383 and H. R. 3384 on this subject and if it is restricted (as those bills now provide) to litigation with respect to the storage and release of water, we will not object. We suggest, however, that it be made clear that the waiver runs only in favor of a State adversely affected by the storage and release spoken of in order to forestall the provisions being looked upon as an open invitation to anyone to institute harassing, even though fruitless, litigation at any time it chooses to do so. We suggest also that the committee bear in mind that this provision, if enacted, will necessarily be read in conjunction with section 208 (c) of the Justice Department Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 549, 560; 43 U. S. C. sec. 666) and that it is unlikely, therefore, that it will be usable except in quite extraordinary circumstances.

(b) We would have no objection, if the committee wishes to include such in the bill that it reports out, to a provision for an "integrating committee" along the lines of that set out in H. R. 270 and H. R. 3384. Its creation would not be in derogation of the ultimate responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in the management of the works covered by it, but it could assist him in securing the advice of representatives of the States concerned and would furnish them with a forum in which to discuss and, it is to be hoped, iron out certain, and perhaps many, of their problems. The creation of such a committee might well assist its members in taking an overall view of the Colorado River and in treating its problems as of basinwide importance. It would also be a useful supplement to, and would perhaps supplant, the advisory provisions of section 16 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. One of the objects of these provisions was to further "any comprehensive plan formulated hereafter for the control, improvement, and utilization of the resources of the Colorado River system" and to assure treatment of the works authorized by that act "as a unit in such control, improvement, and utilization * * *." We have no suggestions to make on the composition of the "integrating" committee.

Quality of water studies

H. R. 3383: Directs the Secretary "to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the

quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversion, of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin."

H. R. 270: Omits the above.

H. R. 2836: Omits the above.

H. R. 3384: Omits the above.

Comment: No objection if the committee sees fit to include a provision along the lines of that included in H. R. 3383.

Denver diversions

H. R. 3383: Omits.

H. R. 270: Authorizes conveyance to the city of Denver of such lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power as may be required by Denver in connection with the development and use of its Blue River project, payment for the value of the rights acquired to be made by Denver to the United States.

H. R. 2836: Same as H. R. 270.

H. R. 3384: Omits.

Comment: The terms of the provision in H. R. 270 are such as not to require objection from this Department. It should be understood, however, that maintenance of the integrity of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, including fulfillment of its obligations to western slope water users in Colorado under Senate Document 80, 75th Congress, whatever those obligations may be, will be ultimately involved in the administration of this provision and that, for this reason, among others, no commitment can be made at this time concerning the exercise of the authority which its enactment would confer upon this Department.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that H. R. 3383, as amended, be enacted.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 3383

A minority of your committee is firmly opposed to the enactment of this bill and presents this summary of views in opposition for your consideration.

Individual members of your minority oppose the bill for various reasons. Consequently, each signatory does not necessarily adopt all objections herein stated. But to facilitate your convenient reading of our various views, most of the important reasons why the project should not be authorized are combined herein.

Again, for convenience in reading, opposing arguments are first summarized, then discussed in detail.

OBJECTIONS TO BILL SUMMARIZED

(1) The \$1½ billion upper Colorado storage project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing.

In actuality, the project is the nondivisible \$1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole project as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it appear palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

(2) Invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by Echo Park Dam and power facilities will be unavoidable if the bill passes.

(3) The project will damage the Nation's agricultural economy:

(a) The project would grow crops already in agricultural surplus.

(b) The project will service, for the most part, only marginal agricultural land.

(c) When needed, there exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped land which can be placed in production at a fraction of the cost of acreage serviced by the project.

(4) The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least \$5 billion (which figure probably is low because it is based on Bureau of Reclamation cost estimates which have proved notoriously short of actual construction costs).

(5) Ninety-eight percent of the project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located.

(6) The appropriation authorization of \$760 million is misleading. It actually amounts to \$933,468,300 based on Bureau of Reclamation estimates. It should be \$1.6 billion to reflect actual direct construction costs.

(7) The huge concealed Federal subsidy to the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico flowing from the project are unwarranted and unconscionable.

(8) The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound and will burden taxpayers for generations to come:

(a) Irrigation projects are financially infeasible, requiring an average subsidy of 88 percent of their cost.

(b) Project repayment provisions are unrealistic and economically indefensible.

(c) The project's financial scheme is based on the impossible assumption that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years.

(d) Low cost nuclear-electric power developments and potentialities have been disregarded and ignored.

(e) The project is not self-liquidating.

(f) The project's power dams are unneeded for power and are included only to subsidize irrigation components.

(9) Central Utah (initial phase), the project's largest irrigation segment, is the most infeasible of all.

(10) Water rights upon which the project depends for power revenues are now in litigation before the Supreme Court and may never become available.

(11) Three physical and geological difficulties in addition to Echo Park make the project unreasonable and impractical:

(a) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam.

(b) The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.

(c) Large quantities of water may be forever lost by absorption into the sandstone walls of Glen Canyon Reservoir.

(12) The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

(13) Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project.

(14) The project wholly ignores the Hoover Commission report.

(15) The bill includes projects which have been disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget.

(16) The bill varies substantially and materially from the administration-approved project:

(a) The bill's projects are different.

(b) A reexamination of economic justification of the project, called for by the administration, is missing.

(c) Financial repayment features are basically contrary from those approved and recommended by the administration.

(17) The project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering, and financial surveys prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete.

(18) The project would critically impair the quantity and quality of water to which the lower Colorado Basin States, particularly southern California, have prior rights.

(19) The project would critically impair operations at Hoover Dam and lose \$187 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

(20) The assistance to the Navajo Indians in the bill is negligible; cost of project's benefits is \$200,000 for each and every Navajo farm.

(21) The project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential.

For the benefit of those who want additional information regarding any of the foregoing 21 reasons why not to authorize the project, the remainder of this report contains detailed data under headings numbered to correspond to the above reasons.

OBJECTIONS TO BILL DETAILED

(1) *The \$1½ billion upper Colorado storage project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing*

The bill as reported out by the committee is S. 500 with all after the enacting clause stricken and the body of H. R. 3383, as amended by the committee, substituted. We thus have two versions of S. 500. The projects they provide for are as follows:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383
Power and storage dams.....	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navajo.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedska-dee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedska-dee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata.

From the foregoing tabulation it may be seen that as to projects, the only difference between the bills is this: the Senate authorizes the Echo Park and Juniper Dams now, as well as the Gooseberry project, while the House version neglects to mention Echo Park and Juniper although it conditionally authorizes Gooseberry.

Although the bills differ in detail, they are essentially the same in objective, and in projects contemplated for development of water and power in the upper Colorado River Basin. Both bills must be considered together and treated as one bill. Should the House pass the measure before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to discuss would be the treatment of these three projects. Chief among them, of course, would be Echo Park.

Should the House act favorably on the pending bill, it is likely that the project authorizations and other provisions of the Senate bill will be added to the House bill in conference. In view of the fact that the Senate refused to eliminate Echo Park by a vote of 52-30, let no Member be deluded that Echo Park is not in this legislation.

(2) *Invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by Echo Park Dam and power facilities will be unavoidable if the bill passes*

Echo Park Dam is still in the bill.—Your committee voted to strike the controversial Echo Park Dam from the bill. But this action was a sham; Echo Park Dam is still in the bill, and the House must be realistic and treat it accordingly.

In actuality, the project is the nondivisible \$1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole project as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it more palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

The Trojan-horse strategy of the proponents of the bill is only too obvious. They voted to remove Echo Park Dam from the House bill to facilitate its passage. However, the proponents know full well that Echo Park Dam will be restored by the conference committee or by legislation in future Congresses. Backers of the bill have been so brazen about this strategy that they discussed it freely with the press. The Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, which has been campaigning hard for the project, on June 9, 1955, reported from Washington on the action by the committee:

Backers of the river bill and Echo Park were not dismayed by the Thursday vote. It has long been a part of upper basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope that it will be restored by a joint House-Senate conference committee. Otherwise, House leaders said it would be impossible to get the project bill through the Rules Committee and past the House.

On July 1, 1955, the same newspaper carried an interview with Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah in which he was quoted as saying:

It we can get a bill through this session, we can amend it later. * * *

Echo Park is still in the bill because the project will not work without it. Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor testified before the 83d Congress that taking Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado storage project would be like taking the pistons out of the engine of an automobile. The project will not function without Echo Park Dam.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer testified before your committee this year that the project would not be economically feasible without Echo Park Dam. He stated that the economic feasibility of the project might be established without Echo Park if some of the participating projects also were deleted. However, this was not done by your committee. It deleted (temporarily) Echo Park, but retained all of the participating projects. In other words, the committee sends to the House a bill which the Commissioner of Reclamation conceded would be economically infeasible.

Echo Park no more can be taken out of this project than history can be abolished by taking out and destroying the page of the history book upon which it is recorded. This is a total project and the maneuvering through the committee and through the House will not succeed in convincing the people that Echo Park Dam is not in the bill, because it is. Even if Echo Park is not restored in conference, which is unlikely, backers of the project will come back to Congress in the

future and say, "We have spent billions of the taxpayers' money on the upper Colorado storage project. Now we have to have Echo Park to make it work. Give us the pistons for the engine."

In the famous words of the Supreme Court:

All others can see and understand this. How can we properly shut our minds to it?

(3) *The project will damage the Nation's agricultural economy*

(a) *The project would grow crops already in agricultural surplus.*—The upper Colorado River project would supply irrigation water for high altitude land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is very important to consider what crops would be grown on this land.

Among the crops now being supported by the Nation's taxpayers are the following: Corn; cotton; wheat; butter; oats; butter oil; cheese; milk, dried; wool; rye; barley; beans, dry; cottonseed oil; grain sorghum; seeds, hay, and pasture; soybeans. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

From Reclamation Bureau reports, a table has been compiled showing the type of crops which would be grown on each of the 33 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops.

The table follows:

Name of project	Aeres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported	Name of project	Aeres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge.....	7, 970	Hay..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Emery County— Continued		Beef cattle..... Dairy cows..... Fruit..... Sheep..... Alfalfa.....	Yes. Yes. Yes.
Seedskadee.....	60, 720	Dairy cows..... Sheep..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Central Utah.....	60, 380	Grain..... Fruit..... Sugar beets..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Lyman.....	40, 600	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Hammond.....	3, 670	Alfalfa..... Grains..... Beans..... Fruit..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Silt.....	7, 300	Alfalfa..... Small grains..... Sugar beets..... Potatoes..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Gooseberry.....	16, 400	Alfalfa..... Pasture..... Grain..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Smith Fork.....	10, 430	Hay..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Navaho.....	137, 240	Alfalfa..... Grains..... Pasture..... Fruit..... Vegetables..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Paonia.....	17, 040	Grain..... Fruit..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	San Juan-Chama.....	225, 000	Alfalfa..... Grains..... Pasture..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Florida.....	18, 950	Alfalfa..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle..... Small grains.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Rabbit Ear.....	19, 190	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Pine River.....	15, 150	Alfalfa..... Hay..... Small grains.....	Yes. Yes. Yes.				
Emery County.....	24, 080	Alfalfa..... Grains.....	Yes. Yes.				

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported	Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
Troublesome.....	13,640	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Fruitland Mesa— Continued Grand Mesa.....	25,300	Sheep..... Dairy cows..... Alfalfa..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Fruit..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
West Divide.....	65,610	Alfalfa..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Ohio Creek.....	16,910	Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook..	31,610	Alfalfa..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Tomichi Creek....	27,580	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Dolores.....	66,000	Alfalfa..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Beans..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Battlement Mesa..	6,830	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Sublette.....	84,000	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Alfalfa..... Grain..... Fruit..... Dairy cows..... Beef cattle.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Bluestone.....	10,875	Alfalfa..... Grain..... Vegetables..... Fruit..... Sugar beets..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Bostwick Park....	6,870	Hay..... Pasture..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Alfalfa..... Small grains..... Pasture..... Beef cattle..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Eagle Divide.....	10,875	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Dallas Creek.....	21,940	Hay..... Pasture..... Beef cattle..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Parshall.....	27,510	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
East River.....	2,750	Hay..... Pasture..... Beef cattle..... Dairy cows..... Sheep.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.	Woody Creek.....	2,965	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows..... Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle..... Sheep..... Dairy cows.....	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Fruitland Mesa..	19,400	Hay..... Pasture..... Small grains..... Beef cattle.....	Yes. Yes.				

(b) *The project will service, for the most part, only marginal agricultural land.*—The Nation's taxpayers would be forced by this bill to spend hundreds of millions on irrigation projects which will supply water for farmlands of relatively poor quality.

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under this bill, will be worth on the average only about \$150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average \$3,000 to \$5,000 per acre on the Bureau's figures. Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than \$100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

(c) *There exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.*—The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage. Development costs would be from \$60 to \$100 an acre for such land. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low cost development in these 21 States as follows:

	<i>Acres</i>		<i>Acres</i>
Alabama.....	683, 000	Missouri.....	323, 000
Arkansas.....	1, 865, 000	New York.....	100, 000
Florida.....	1, 970, 000	North Carolina.....	1, 157, 000
Georgia.....	1, 721, 000	Ohio.....	95, 000
Illinois.....	69, 000	Pennsylvania.....	90, 000
Indiana.....	135, 000	South Carolina.....	996, 000
Kentucky.....	170, 000	Tennessee.....	242, 000
Louisiana.....	2, 769, 000	Texas.....	3, 928, 000
Michigan.....	690, 000	Virginia.....	514, 000
Minnesota.....	874, 000	Wisconsin.....	316, 000
Mississippi.....	1, 272, 000		

(4) *The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least \$5 billion*

The projects authorized in section 1 and those approved in section 2 for priority of investigation and completion of planning reports, will necessitate an estimated cost of \$1,535,898,400 and an additional subsidy of some \$4 billion by way of interest the Federal Government would have to pay on the money it borrowed to construct the project.

But these are not the only projects the upper basin States will seek, and section 3 of the bill gives notice to that effect. The upper basin plan, which it is the purpose of the bill to initiate, is to get authorization by Congress of additional projects so that the upper basin States can use, if available, the full 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned to them under the Colorado River compact. The Bureau of Reclamation has inventoried a total of some 100 projects in the upper basin, with a construction cost of \$5 billion. Under the feasibility standards employed for the authorization of the projects named in the bill, any project proposed by the Bureau will become feasible.

Projects are authorized by this bill on which the irrigators are only able to repay 15 percent or less of the project cost. The construction cost averages \$750 to \$900 an acre for lands, which, when they have received all of the benefits of this bill, will be worth only \$150 an acre. There is no such thing as an infeasible project under the type of financing proposed by the Bureau in this bill, which is to dedicate the power revenues of the Government dams to subsidize irrigation for as long as may be necessary to retire the principal of any debt, however large, provided the taxpayers pay the interest on the Government bonds sold to build the project.

The resulting subsidy with which the Nation's taxpayers would be burdened on only the initiation of this gigantic scheme would be \$4 billion. While nothing in the Colorado River compact obligates the

Federal Government to build any projects in the upper basin, the upper basin proponents treat their allocation of water under the compact as a blank draft upon the Federal Treasury, justifying any projects proposed by them, regardless of their infeasibility under existing standards of reclamation law.

Additionally, it is impossible to tell how much more it will require in direct construction costs to complete the project than the amounts estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau's estimates to Congress have proved notoriously short of actual costs, as is strikingly shown by the following table covering projects authorized between 1903 and 1944:

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Hondo, N. Mex.	1903	¹ \$359,000	\$371,788
Milk River, Mont.	1903	1,000,000	9,881,774
Newlands, Nev.	1903	1,250,000	7,899,479
North Platte, Nebr.	1903	2,516,000	27,939,501
Salt River, Ariz.	1903	2,800,000	26,244,688
Uncompahgre, Colo.	1903	1,300,000	8,965,959
Belle Fourche, S. Dak.	1904	2,100,000	5,288,236
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak. (old)	1904	(²)	223,423
Lower Yellowstone, Mont.-N. Dak.	1904	1,200,000	3,633,219
Minidoka, Idaho-Wyo.	1904	2,600,000	43,706,054
Shoshone, Wyo.-Mont.	1904	¹ 7,828,000	23,673,962
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif.	1904	3,000,000	5,806,743
Boise, Idaho.	1905	¹ 10,852,000	66,371,938
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	1905	¹ 605,000	5,800,683
Garden City, Kans.	1905	¹ 419,000	334,475
Huntley, Mont.	1905	900,000	1,552,159
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.	1905	¹ 4,470,000	18,871,222
Okanogan, Wash.	1905	444,000	1,633,973
Rio Grande, N. Mex.-Tex.	1905	2,317,113	27,337,078
Strawberry Valley, Utah	1905	1,250,000	3,498,994
Umatilla, Oreg.	1905	1,000,000	5,324,457
Yakima, Wash.	1905	10,000,000	60,359,928
Sun River, Mont.	1906	7,372,000	10,059,013
Williston, N. Dak.	1906	(²)	409,095
Orland, Calif.	1907	¹ 607,000	2,564,519
Grand Valley, Colo.	1911	¹ 3,621,663	6,765,733
King Hill, Idaho.	1917	527,230	1,987,854
Yuma auxiliary, Arizona	1917	(³)	2,266,487
Riverton, Wyo.	1920	9,465,000	26,626,000
Owyhee, Oreg.-Idaho.	1926	17,715,000	18,998,744
Vale, Oreg.	1926	3,590,000	4,962,697
Weber River, Utah	1927	3,000,000	2,725,885
All American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.	1928	38,500,000	67,614,755
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev. (Hoover Dam and powerplant)	1928	126,500,000	172,070,000
Bitter Root, Mont.	1930	750,000	1,037,087
Baker, Oreg.	1931	200,000	281,589
Burnt River, Oreg.	1935	550,000	601,026
Central Valley, Calif.	1935	170,000,000	737,774,000
Colorado Basin, Wash.	1935	487,030,228	754,476,000
Frenchtown, Mont.	1935	220,000	290,797
Humboldt, Nev.	1935	2,000,000	1,214,321
Hyrum, Utah	1935	930,000	953,854
Kendrick, Wyo.	1935	20,004,000	37,738,385
Moon Lake, Utah	1935	1,500,000	1,599,359
Odgen River, Utah	1935	3,500,000	4,735,284
Parker Dam, Ariz.-Calif. (power)	1935	21,767,000	24,201,808
Provo River, Utah	1935	9,974,000	33,452,199
Sanpete, Utah	1935	375,000	374,540
Truckee storage, Nevada-California	1935	1,000,000	1,092,423
Buffalo Rapids, Mont.	1937	3,055,000	5,669,336
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo.	1937	31,702,772	164,131,000
Colorado River, Tex.	1937	20,000,000	23,961,794
Deschutes, Oreg.	1937	8,000,000	12,943,000
Gila, Ariz.	1937	19,474,000	⁴ 50,083,860
Pine River, Colo.	1937	3,240,000	3,471,437
Tueumcari, N. Mex.	1937	8,278,000	⁵ 15,540,011
Austin, W. C., Okla.	1938	5,600,000	12,295,102

¹ Estimated in H. Doe. 1262, 61st Cong., 3d sess., Fund for Reclamation of Arid Lands, 1911.

² Combined cost of Williston and Buford-Trenton estimated in 1911 at \$1,195,000.

³ Included in estimate of Yuma project.

⁴ Exclusive of contemplated allocation of \$1,553,565 of cost of Imperial Dam herein included in All American Canal project.

⁵ Exclusive of cost of storage works (Conchas Dam) constructed by Corps of Engineers.

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Fort Peck, Mont.-N. Dak., (exclusive of powerplant and dam)	1938	-----	\$25, 400, 000
Fruitgrowers Dam, Colo.	1938	\$200, 000	200, 309
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak., (WCU)	1939	1, 500, 000	1, 238, 546
Paonia, Colo.	1939	3, 030, 000	6, 723, 308
Rapid Valley, S. Dak.	1939	1, 118, 000	927, 412
Colorado River, Ariz.-Calif.-Nev. (front work-levees)	1940	(⁶)	⁶ 12, 190, 000
Eden, Wyo.	1940	2, 445, 000	6, 152, 000
Mancos, Colo.	1940	1, 475, 000	3, 928, 000
Mirage Flats, Nebr.	1940	2, 560, 000	3, 282, 588
Newton, Utah	1940	595, 000	712, 591
San Luis Valley, Colo., (1st unit)	1940	17, 465, 000	56, 230, 577
Davis Dam, Nev.- Ariz.-Calif.	1941	41, 200, 000	118, 902, 056
Palisades, Idaho-Wyo.	1941	24, 092, 000	76, 601, 000
Scotfield, Utah	1943	640, 000	943, 889
Balmorhea, Tex.	1944	347, 000	429, 554
Hungry Horse, Mont. (power)	1944	48, 319, 000	102, 900, 000
Intake, Mont.	1944	62, 000	90, 530
Missoula Valley, Mont.	1944	250, 000	278, 762
Rathdrum Prairie, Idaho	1944	300, 000	482, 360
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	1946	1, 466, 000	2, 488, 000
Arnold, Oreg.	1947	220, 000	205, 535
Cachuma, Calif.	1948	32, 310, 000	36, 967, 000
Ochoco, Oreg.	1948	1, 500, 000	849, 830
Preston Bench, Idaho	1948	453, 000	449, 554
Solano, Calif.	1948	45, 577, 000	47, 111, 000
Fort Sumner, N. Mex.	1949	1, 798, 000	2, 434, 257
Grants Pass, Oreg.	1949	100, 000	100, 000
Weber Basin, Utah	1949	69, 534, 000	70, 385, 000
Canadian River, Tex.	1950	-----	96, 079, 100
Eklutna, Alaska	1950	20, 365, 400	33, 800, 000
Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex.	1950	30, 179, 000	29, 606, 000
Vermejo, N. Mex.	1950	2, 679, 000	2, 919, 000
Collbran, Colo.	1952	-----	17, 236, 000

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	1944	\$8, 104, 000	⁷ \$52, 795, 000
Canyon Ferry unit, Montana	1944	11, 025, 000	28, 844, 000
Crow Creek pump unit, Montana	1944	1, 525, 000	1, 766, 000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1944	26, 894, 500	⁸ 73, 943, 000
Kirwin, Kans.	1944	10, 000, 000	20, 474, 000
Marias, Mont. (lower unit)	1944	19, 700, 000	67, 878, 000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	1944	2, 470, 000	9, 630, 000
Webster unit, Kansas	1944	7, 800, 000	24, 636, 000
Angostura unit, South Dakota	1944	3, 300, 000	14, 163, 000
Boysen unit, Wyoming	1944	8, 202, 000	34, 254, 000
Dickinson unit, North Dakota	1944	354, 630	1, 824, 000
Fort Clark unit, North Dakota	1944	-----	774, 000
Keyhole unit, Wyoming-South Dakota	1944	750, 000	4, 820, 000
Savage unit, Montana	1944	-----	564, 000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas	1944	7, 611, 000	18, 286, 000
Heart Butte unit, North Dakota	1944	2, 497, 280	6, 223, 000
Shadehill unit, South Dakota	1944	2, 327, 000	11, 445, 000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	1944	13, 311, 600	15, 589, 000
Missouri diversion unit, Montana	1944	23, 831, 000	61, 993, 000
Jamestown unit, North Dakota	1944	6, 984, 000	8, 576, 000

⁶ \$100,000 per year.

⁷ Except for total estimated cost, figures include \$3,467,000 of the cost of Corps of Engineers Harlan County Dam allocated to irrigation.

⁸ Except for total estimated cost, figures include \$6 million of the cost of Corps of Engineers Red Willow Dam allocated to irrigation.

(5) *Ninety-eight percent of the project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located*

Less than 2 percent of the cost of the Colorado River storage project would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The percentage of the Federal tax burden paid by those States, of the other States of the Union, and the amount in dollars which each will have to pay, as calculated by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, is as follows:

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama.....	0.93	\$10,164,900	\$13,280,400	\$15,354,300	\$31,889,700
Arizona.....	.41	4,481,300	5,851,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas.....	.48	5,246,400	6,851,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California.....	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado.....	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut.....	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware.....	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida.....	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia.....	1.30	14,209,000	18,561,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho.....	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois.....	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana.....	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa.....	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas.....	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky.....	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana.....	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine.....	.38	4,151,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland.....	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts.....	3.23	35,301,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan.....	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota.....	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi.....	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri.....	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana.....	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska.....	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada.....	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire.....	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey.....	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico.....	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York.....	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina.....	1.38	15,083,400	19,703,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota.....	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio.....	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma.....	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon.....	.95	10,383,500	13,536,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania.....	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island.....	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina.....	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota.....	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee.....	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas.....	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah.....	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont.....	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,000	5,486,400
Virginia.....	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,400	50,749,200
Washington.....	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia.....	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin.....	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming.....	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.....	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total.....	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

(6) The appropriation authorization is misleading

Section 12 of the bill reported by the committee contains an appropriation authorization of "such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act but not to exceed \$760,000,000." This implies that such sum is sufficient to construct the projects authorized by the act. In fact, according to the Reclamation Bureau figures contained in the hearings, an additional \$173,468,300 would be required to construct the authorized features, bringing the total sum to \$933,468,000.

In view of the notoriously inadequate estimates made in the past by the Bureau, it is a very good possibility that ultimate costs for these features alone will be well over \$1 billion.

In any event it should be thoroughly understood that the figure used in the bill will not, according to Bureau estimates, construct this project. Instead of \$760 million the actual figure is \$933 million, or, if a lower Curecanti should be constructed (either is authorized by the bill) the cost would be \$894 million. Here are the figures taken from those supplied by the Bureau at pages 64-67 of the hearings. The projects here accounted for are only those named as authorized in section 1 of the bill:

11 participating projects-----	\$304, 356, 300	
Glen Canyon Dam-----	421, 270, 000	
Flaming Gorge-----	82, 942, 000	
Navajo (dam and reservoir only)-----	36, 400, 000	
Curecanti (940,000 acre-feet)-----	49, 305, 000	
		\$894, 273, 300
Curecanti (modified plan)-----	88, 500, 000	933, 468, 300

Actually, the project development sought to be authorized by the bill is just the starter for some 34 or more storage and reclamation projects specifically named, contemplated, and designated in House Document 364 as the upper Colorado River storage project, involving a construction cost of \$1.6 billion at least, or over twice the amount of the appropriation set forth in the House bill. The figure of \$760 million in the House bill is an attempt to hide from Congress the true cost of the development.

(7) *The huge concealed Federal subsidy to the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico is unwarranted and unconscionable*

Under the proposed plans of financing the project, the concealed subsidy by way of accumulating interest on money borrowed to construct the project would be huge. Its burden would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers for generations to come.

Under the repayment provisions of the Senate approved project bill, the concealed Federal subsidy on only the projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior (Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and 11 participating projects) as estimated and admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation would be \$1,153 million over the repayment period or \$3,150 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated. If the four additional storage units and the Navajo, San Juan-Chama, and Gooseberry participating reclamation projects authorized by the Senate bill are included, the corresponding Federal subsidy, based upon equivalent methods of computation, would amount to \$4 billion or over \$5,000 per acre on the 745,000 acres to be irrigated.

Under the repayment provisions of House project bill, the concealed Federal subsidy on the minimum number of projects authorized by the bill (4 storage units and 11 participating projects) would amount to \$1.6 billion at the end of the overall repayment period of 90 to 95 years, or \$4,300 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated; but with the inclusion of additional projects contemplated for authorization, the subsidy would be substantially the same as under the Senate approved bill, namely \$4 billion or \$5,000 per acre.

As compared to Federal subsidies amounting to \$3,000 to \$5,000 per acre that would be involved in the project, the value of irrigated land in the area of the proposed reclamation projects averages only about \$150 per acre.

In view of the fact that the crops that would be grown on the proposed project's high altitude marginal land would be largely hay,

grain, and forage crops for livestock, and dairy products, which are now largely surplus and would in turn be resubsidized under the farm program, the huge Federal subsidy required for the proposed upper Colorado River project would be a totally unwarranted and unconscionable burden on the Nation's taxpayers for many generations hence.

(8) *The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound and will burden taxpayers for generations to come*

(a) *Irrigation projects are financially infeasible, requiring an average subsidy of 88 percent of the cost.*—None of the reclamation components of the project would be financially sound themselves. The original direct irrigation investments on the 11 projects recommended by the Secretary range from \$200 to nearly \$800 per acre for the central Utah project (initial phase). For the Navajo project authorized by the Senate-approved bill, the original investment would be over \$1,500 per acre. Including the cost of the storage units allocated to irrigation, the average direct investment (construction cost) disregarding hidden interest, would be \$750 to \$900 per acre, varying with the number of projects included.

As compared to these costs, the average value of already irrigated farmlands in the project area is about \$150 per acre. Thus, the average investment proposed by the project would be 5 to 6 times the average value of the land after irrigation.

Of the total irrigation investment, the irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay about 12 percent. Consequently, these irrigation projects must be subsidized to the extent of about 88 percent either by power revenues or directly from the Federal Treasury by such devices as allocations for assumed "flood-control benefits," "fish and wildlife benefits," etc.

(b) *Project repayment provisions are unrealistic and economically indefensible.*—The proposed repayment plan for the project would be to pay off the entire irrigation investment in 50 years by applying all power and irrigation revenues toward that end. Thereafter, the huge power investment would be paid off in not to exceed 100 years.

The record reveals that such a plan might work in the case of a development comprising the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and the 11 participating reclamation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but would fail with additional projects added.

At the House hearings, a Bureau witness (E. O. Larson) stated (p. 215, House hearings on H. R. 3383):

With 11 participating projects paid out concurrently, you could do that and pay off power in less than 100 years. But one disadvantage of that plan is that you cannot take on more than the 11 projects without raising the power rate, if additional projects are developed while the power is taking 100 years to pay out, the higher you have to raise the power rates.

Studies indicate that the minimum number of projects specified for authorization in the House bill might pay out under the repayment provisions of the bill, and that it would take 90 to 95 years to repay the power investment with power sold at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. But with additional projects added, either storage units or irrigation projects, either the power rate would have to be materially increased to get within the 100-year payment period for power, or the period of repayment would be far greater than 100 years.

The \$1.6 billion overall project would have no possibility of payout with 6-mill power under the repayment provisions of the House bill. In fact, it could never pay out under such a financial program.

Moreover, to predicate a repayment plan on continuing revenues from hydroelectric power development for 100 years in the future is unrealistic and unsound, in view of possible changes in economic conditions, obsolescence and competing sources of power, including atomic energy.

(c) *The project's financial scheme is based on the impossible assumption that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years.*—Six mills or more, the price to be charged for power generated by the hydroelectric plants in this project, is an extremely high rate for public power. There is no guaranty that the power can be sold at that rate. The bill does not require that contracts for the sale of the power be negotiated before construction begins, such as was required under the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized Hoover Dam.

It is especially doubtful that a market for 6-mill power will continue for 100 years—a full century—as contemplated by the bill. These power units will be located in a region having boundless energy potential in the greatest coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits in the country. These resources, combined with the approaching availability of atomic electric power, will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete in the near future, and the project will not be able to repay the Federal Treasury as scheduled, or, perhaps, at all.

(d) *Low cost nuclear-electric power developments and potentialities have been disregarded and ignored.*—The age of nuclear power has arrived and electric power companies are already building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.

Tied in the bill are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations, but also 88 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power "cash register."

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Just 15 years ago, in 1940, nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commercial nuclear-electric-energy generating plants actually are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic-power stations at an estimated cost of \$840 million. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present conventional generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane of Oak Ridge National Laboratory show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of \$100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1- or 2-mill current instead of 6.7-mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its fuel value of about \$20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

Within 5 years, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course, are the hydroelectric plants involved in this project.

(e) *The project is not self-liquidating, as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.*—The Bureau presents this as being a self-liquidating project. Plain arithmetic shows that it would not be. Simple interest alone, even at $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent, on \$1 billion of original investment for the smaller project proposed is \$25 million per year; for the larger \$1.6 billion development proposed is \$40 million per year. Total net revenues, as estimated by the Bureau for the smaller or larger developments, would average less than these amounts. As the project could not pay simple interest on the investments, its revenues could never retire the capital cost. The Nation's taxpayers would have to do that. Or if revenues were earmarked to retire the capital, the taxpayers would have to pay about all of the interest. In any event, the net burden on the taxpayers would be more than \$1 billion for the smaller development and \$4 billion for the larger development, by the end of the proposed repayment period. The accumulated debt would keep on increasing until paid off by general taxation since it could never be repaid from project revenues.

(f) *The dams are needed only to subsidize the irrigation projects.*—The sole purpose for including the giant power dams in the bill is to provide power revenues to subsidize 88 percent of the cost of the participating irrigation projects. The dams are first and foremost big "cash registers" for the landowners to be served by the irrigation projects. Their revenues would not benefit the whole Nation, but only these favored few residents of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Glen Canyon Dam, by far the largest in the chain of four, is located so far downstream that none of the water to be stored in it will be used to irrigate the participating projects.

The Interior Department admits that for at least 25 years the dams will not be needed for river regulation. The facts show that upper basin development will not require these storage units for river regulation for up to 50 years and probably longer.

The dams cannot be justified because of a need for power in the upper Colorado region. Steam power could be produced more cheaply by using the region's vast coal reserves.

The sole function of the dams for at least 50 years will be to provide revenues from the sale of power to pay for the participating projects, if, in fact, the power can be sold at the contemplated 6-mill rate, which is doubtful.

(9) *Central Utah (initial phase), the project's largest irrigation segment, is the most infeasible of all*

The central Utah project (initial phase) which would cost \$127 million for irrigation alone and irrigate but 160,000 acres at a cost of \$794 per acre, exclusive of hidden interest subsidy by the taxpayers. The Bureau studies show that the water users could repay only \$94 per acre over a period of 70 years, or only 12 percent of the cost.

Such a submarginal project should not be considered for authorization until the Congress has available to it an investigation and report by a disinterested board of engineers.

It of course cannot be denied, and is not here denied, that such a project would be of some benefit to local area residents and land-owners. But such benefits could accrue to any area in which the Federal Government could be prevailed upon to erect some power feature, the revenues of which, for untold periods in the future, would be used to pay 88 percent of the cost of putting water on the land. This, in effect, is a thinly veiled Federal grant.

(10) *Water rights upon which the project depends for power revenues are now in litigation before the Supreme Court and may never become available*

The whole financial structure of the Colorado River storage project depends upon power production at Glen Canyon Dam, and this in turn depends on whether or not the upper Basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right, as against the lower Basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if it is needed for domestic and agricultural uses in the lower basin. The upper basin spokesmen are in disagreement among themselves on this point. Governor Johnson of Colorado submitted a prepared statement in the Senate hearings in which he said:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin.

Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the 7-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the 7-State compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Governor Johnson bases his contention on articles III (c) and IV (b) of the Colorado River compact, which provide:

ART. III (c). The States of the Upper Division shall not withhold water, and the States of the Lower Division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

ART. IV (b). Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River System may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

If Governor Johnson is right, all the estimates of power revenues at Glen Canyon are wrong, because they are based upon the assumption that if the upper basin States release to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet in each 10 years (the minimum required by art. III (d) of the compact), they may keep everything else. (Even at that, it would take 25 years to fill Glen Canyon Dam if the next quarter century is as dry as the last 25 years.)

These questions of interpretation of the Colorado River compact are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Arizona v. California, et al.* Whether or not the upper States, who have been impleaded by California, become parties to that case, the Court cannot divide the water in the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada, without ascertaining how much water these States have a right to receive from the four upper States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions in Glen Canyon Dam on an interpretation of the Colorado River compact which is challenged by the Governor of Colorado, and may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is already pending in that Court. The consideration of this bill should await the Supreme Court decision.

(11) *Three physical and geological difficulties in addition to Echo Park make the project unreasonable and impractical*

(a) *There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam.*—In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between October 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified at that time before your Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built.

At 700 feet Glen Canyon would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. This formation is nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune. It was created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of the other.

The minority members of your committee are not satisfied that the Bureau of Reclamation officials have proved their case sufficiently that a 700-foot dam can be safely constructed at the Glen Canyon site without costly additional safety features.

(b) *The construction of Glen Canyon Dam will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.*—Rainbow Natural Bridge is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. Dynamite will be exploded within a mile on either side of the bridge, thus jeopardizing a rare natural wonder. In addition, seepage from the Glen Canyon Reservoir may back up under Rainbow Arch. If the sandstone of Rainbow Bridge gets wet and soaked up with water, it will be reduced in strength and may crumble.

(c) *Large quantities of water may be absorbed and lost in the walls of Glen Canyon.*—Bureau officials concede that at least 3 million acre-feet of water will seep into the porous sandstone walls of Glen Canyon, but they failed to make studies to determine the exact quantity of

water that may be lost in this way. However, it has been independently calculated, assuming 250 miles of canyon wall and an average depth of 200 feet, that 32 million acre-feet would be absorbed by the porous sandstone walls. This is more than the storage capacity of the entire Glen Canyon Reservoir. Stacked on a football field, this amount of water would tower over 6,000 miles into the sky. It would be taken out of use forever in this highly arid region that so badly needs every available drop of water.

(12) *The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics*

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects, which are both economically and financially infeasible, (1) by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits, while (2) at the same time overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1.—On one participating project (the Hammond), the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only \$2.02 per acre per year, but says the direct benefits are \$41.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2.—The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time (which may be as long as 25 years) the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskaadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find \$638,500 of "indirect benefits" and \$313,100 of "public benefits" to add to the finding of \$614,500 in "direct benefits" (all items over a 100-year period), to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The "indirect benefits" category includes such nebulous factors as "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers," while the "public benefits" category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau guesses as to the "increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy."

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

(13) *Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project*

Example 1.—Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill:

- (a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years;
- (b) the municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit;
- (c) the irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years "in addition to any development period authorized by law."

Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Example 2.—Present law requires that no contract relating to power or municipal water be made unless it will not impair the project for irrigation purposes. Under the bill, contracts relating to municipal water may be made without regard to this section. Although this may not be a bad result, it is another symptom of eroding the reclamation law by individual pieces of legislation instead of considering such matters in the context of a national water policy bill.

Example 3.—Present law requires interest at "not less than" 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

Example 4.—Present law requires a finding of engineering and financial feasibility, the latter to be in terms of the 40-year repayment ability. Under this bill, the so-called benefit-cost ratio has been substituted for financial feasibility in order to come up with an "economic" feasibility based on fantastic national benefits supposedly to be realized. This constitutes one of the greatest breaches of present law and leaves Congress with no well-defined standards of feasibility whatsoever.

(14) *The project wholly ignores the Hoover Commission report*

The Hoover Commission report has just been released. The bill ignores any of the counsel to be gained from the labors of the Commission, which has completed a detailed study of this entire complex field. In fact, the proponents of this gigantic scheme tried to get it through Congress before the Hoover Commission made its report, so blind have they been to the true national welfare in connection with water resources.

However one may disagree with some of the recommendations of the Commission and the task force, your minority submits that the members of this group should be heard before Congress commits itself to the billion-dollar precedents of this bill. It should not be forgotten that this Commission was established by Congress to report to Congress so that Congress might consider the advisability of legislation to implement some if not all of the Commission recommendations. Regardless of the jeers heard from spokesmen for special interests, your minority considers that the people of this country respect the industry and the sincerity of the Hoover Commission inquiries.

Your minority believes that the people are entitled to and will demand a thorough consideration of the Commission reports in every

field. For example, in the water resources field, the Commission report relates five conditions which the task force found to be necessary for the success of reclamation projects:

1. They must have technical feasibility.
2. They must be sound financially.
3. They must have fertile soil capable of agricultural production over long periods of years.
4. They must have adequate and suitable water supply.
5. There must be farmers available who are interested in and enthusiastic for irrigation agriculture.

Relating these to the project before Congress, the record shows there is question as to the technical feasibility of the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam; the financing is wholly unsound; the soil by and large is of dubious quality; and the water supply is actively in litigation in the Supreme Court.

The Commission further found "experience shows that the farmers alone cannot bear the whole cost of irrigation projects." Conceding this, would it not be a proper inquiry for Congress to determine what the farmers should pay? Should they pay only 12 percent, as this bill allows? If so, who should bear the balance of the cost, local area residents or the taxpayer in every corner of this Nation?

The Hoover Commission makes a pertinent suggestion on this score—that the beneficiaries (including States) contribute at least 50 percent—which may well be forgotten if the "hydro-headed" monster now before Congress becomes law.

(15) The bill includes projects which have been disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget

The Budget Bureau has specifically recommended that the Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, and Navaho units not be authorized at this time. The Bureau has pointed out that there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of these projects due to the lack of data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the works.

With respect to participating projects outrightly authorized for construction in section 1 of the bill, the Bureau of the Budget has submitted that their authorization should be conditioned upon a new finding of favorable economic justification by the Secretary of Interior which must include (a) a joint study with the Department of Agriculture of the direct agricultural benefits of each project and (b) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of each project, based upon a reexamination of the methods presently used to compute the indirect and public benefits of reclamation projects. Based on the insufficiency of the available information regarding these participating projects, which this bill would authorize, the Budget Bureau has stated that a reexamination is necessary "so that there could be no doubt about the economic justification of the projects finally undertaken."

Congress should not undertake to authorize questionable or unjustified projects. Until the information requested by the Bureau of the Budget is made available, Congress should not act on these projects.

(16) *The bill varies substantially and materially from the administration-approved project*

(a) *The bill's projects are different.*—The administration recommended authorization of 2 storage units, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating reclamation projects, at an estimated construction cost of \$930 million.

The Senate bill authorizes 6 storage units including Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Juniper, and Navajo in addition to Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 22 additional reclamation projects, involving a combined estimated construction cost of over \$1.6 billion.

The House bill authorizes 4 storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo—and the 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also in section 2 provides what is tantamount to an advance commitment of the Congress to authorize the 23 additional reclamation projects (the same as named in the Senate bill with 1 addition, Animas-LaPlata).

(b) *A reexamination of economic justification of the project, called for by the administration, is necessary.*—The administration recommended that the legislation provide that authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditioned on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements, with reports submitted to the Congress on each project; and that new studies of direct agricultural benefits be made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

The bill contains no provision for the reevaluation specified by the administration whatsoever and hence ignores this important requirement set forth as a condition precedent to administration approval.

(c) *Financial repayment features are basically contrary to those approved and recommended by the administration.*—The administration set up as a requirement that all reimbursable costs of the project should be repaid in 50 years, together with interest on the unamortized balance of the investments in power and municipal water supply features.

The bill departs materially from the specified repayment criteria. It apparently adheres to repayment of irrigation investment in 50 years, as recommended. However, it provides that the power investment be repaid within the expected economic life of the power unit but not exceeding 100 years, or twice the 50-year repayment period specified by the administration.

(17) *The project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering and financial survey prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete*

The official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of Bureau witnesses clearly show that the investigations, surveys, and studies in regard to engineering and the economic and financial aspects of the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects are incomplete and inadequate.

The provisions of the Senate bill itself, which require further studies and report by the Secretary of the Interior on economic feasibility and financial reimbursability of the 11 participating projects previously recommended by the Secretary, demonstrate that reliable information is not now available even on those projects that the Bureau has already reported upon. The House bill seeks to cover up this def-

ciency even in the face of the clear recommendation of the administration that these projects be reevaluated before authorization.

The Senate bill with which the House bill might go to conference includes authorization of scores of projects on which no reports have as yet been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, on many of which only the barest reconnaissance data is now available.

The record reveals the need for much more thorough investigations and studies of the proposed storage units. Even as to the Glen Canyon storage unit, the Interior Department officials have expressed concern over the adequacy of the foundations and have stated that decisions as to final plans would not be made until further studies are completed after authorization. Plans for the other storage dams are even less decisive. Thus there is grave question as to the adequacy of cost estimates and the financial feasibility of the storage features of the project.

In addition, it is clear from the record of the hearings that the proposed storage units of the project will not supply any water to the reclamation components now proposed and are not needed to enable these projects to obtain and use the amount of water estimated by the Bureau to be required. Yet under the House bill, it is proposed to spend about \$600 million, and under the Senate bill about \$750 million, for storage units that are not to be needed to meet basic water supply requirements for at least 25 years and probably more.

In view of the foregoing, action on the project at this time would be premature and without justification.

(18) *The project would critically impair the quantity and quality of water to which the lower Colorado Basin States, particularly southern California, have prior rights*

A football field is slightly more than a acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the project is built as now planned.

This is true because the multi-billion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California. Thereafter, the dams would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by the 11 irrigation components recommended by the Bureau.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that most of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these 7 States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

That is why billions from the United States Treasury should not be spent to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

Additionally, the project threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalis and salts before use in homes and factories. Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject. Based on it they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre. Just how long soil could continue growing crops in face of this is speculative.

The effect would be similar in home and industrial water systems, to say nothing of the already irritated digestive tracts of almost 6 million southern Californians.

(19) The project would critically impair operations at Hoover Dam and lose \$187 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury

During the 25-year period of filling the dams contemplated by the bill, firm power output at Hoover Dam would be reduced by 25 percent. Secondary energy would be wiped out entirely. This shortage would cost the lower basin about 200 additional millions of dollars for replacement power and cost the Federal Treasury about \$187 million in lost revenues.

To say the least, this is a strange power policy for the Federal Government to follow. First it builds Hoover Dam on the lower reaches of the Colorado River. The power can be produced very cheaply so the Secretary of the Interior enters into contracts to sell certain quantities of power at rates of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour and less. Then the Federal Government builds additional dams upstream.

Here power cannot be produced so cheaply. But in order to generate power at these upstream dams to be sold at 6 mills, it cuts back the production of 2-mill power at Hoover Dam, which is already constructed and operating efficiently. This is Government waste with a vengeance.

Essentially, the Colorado River storage project implies the destruction or impairment of 25 percent of the value of the Boulder Canyon project to help make possible the construction of a new project upstream, to furnish power at over twice the cost and water at several times the cost of that which would be taken away from the lower basin, in violation of the covenant of the Government in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and in the power and water contracts made under that act.

Moreover, the Federal Government will be in breach of solemn contractual obligations if it curtails energy output at Hoover by intercepting water for creating power heads at the upstream dams. The project may not legally impound water for power purposes if needed to generate electrical energy at the lower basin dams. If the Federal Government breaches its contracts with power contractees in the lower basin by cutting back power deliveries at Hoover Dam, it will be subject to suit for hundreds of millions of dollars in damages.

(20) *The assistance to Navajo Indians in the bill is negligible; cost of project's benefits is \$200,000 for each and every Navajo farm*

The assistance to the Navajo Indians in the bill would be negligible without the addition of the costly Navajo reclamation project.

The bill would authorize the Navajo Dam and Reservoir only and this does not irrigate any Navajo lands. The water stored in the reservoir could not be used for irrigation of Indian lands unless and until canals and other facilities of an additional reclamation project are authorized and built, involving a construction cost of \$175 million or more.

According to testimony presented at the hearings, the Indian Bureau contemplates that the additional reclamation project would provide for 1,100 Navajo Indian family farms. The cost per family farm would be about \$200,000. Indian Bureau witnesses estimate the gross income per family farm would be \$5,000 a year. In comparison, it should be noted that the \$200,000 of capital proposed to be expended per family farm would, if invested at 5 percent interest, yield an income of twice the estimated gross farm income.

In view of these facts, consideration might well be given to some different program for use of Federal funds to rehabilitate the Navajo Indians that would be more beneficial to them and more practicable and effective from the standpoint of the Federal Government than the costly irrigation project as proposed. In this connection, the record indicates that it is not certain that the Navajo Indians either want to farm irrigated lands, or would succeed as irrigation farmers.

(21) *The project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential*

The region in which the project would be constructed is unbelievably rich in natural resources. These are the measures of its future potential.

The water resources of the area are of measurable quantity, and their potential benefits to agriculture would be small. On the other hand, the benefits which these limited water supplies could bring to a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable and of unlimited value.

Irrigation is a very uneconomic user of water. The value of crops grown under western irrigation is equal to about 10 cents for each 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn. The value of manufactured products amounts to about \$5 for each 1,000 gallons withdrawn.

The potential thermal power resources of the project area are beyond comprehension. In the heart of this land, the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing a horse-and-buggy economy that would cripple forever opportunities to create a profitable and unlimited industrial economy.

Steam or nuclear plants to provide electrical energy in these States could be built by private capital, with no Federal subsidy involved. They would create new employment in the coalfields and in the industries that would build to take advantage of the available power. Thus a sound stone would be placed in the area's economy by each plant and each job created, and the plants, the new industries, and those employed by them, would pay taxes to the local, State and Federal Governments.

Agricultural development will seriously injure, if not kill, all opportunities to build such a sound economy. There is only so much water, and the most wasteful way to use it would be by subsidizing unneeded, extravagant, and wasteful irrigation projects. The hope of the area lies in a modern-age industrial program, not a surplus-ridden farm economy.

JOHN P. SAYLOR.
JOHN R. PILLION.
CRAIG HOSMER.
JAMES B. UTT.
JAMES A. HALEY.
GEO. A. SHUFORD.

A MINORITY REPORT IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 3383 AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION

Since the very early days of the Nation's history the Federal Government has been able to promote economic growth by expenditure of its handiest and cheapest resource—land. Millions of acres of land have been given to individuals, to corporations, and to lesser Government agencies, the proceeds from the sale of which, or the use of which were for the promotion of the Nation's economy. Now, however, Federal investment in economic growth involves cash from taxpayers' funds in the United States Treasury. The sum total of all such expenditures affects the tax rates, and because the taxpayer is paying such a large share of his income in taxes he is entitled to get his full money's worth from each suggested additional expenditure.

The Colorado River storage project as here proposed, in our opinion, is one which is uneconomical and unnecessary, and will not contribute to our national economic growth, but on the contrary will constitute a handicap and a drain on the Nation's purse.

EXPENDITURES FOR WATER RESOURCES

Since 1941 the Federal Government has appropriated some \$9½ billion for water resource projects and has authorized projects which will cost another \$18½ billion. We are informed that if all proposed projects presently under discussion and consideration, including the upper Colorado River storage project, were authorized, the above totals would amount to over \$70 billion. This is an astounding figure, it is equal to one-fourth of the national debt.

COSTS

Most Federal water projects seem to have one thing in common, a major underestimation of costs.

Estimates of benefits also have been excessive. Examination by the Hoover Task Force on Water Resources has revealed that construction cost per acre for irrigated land of a group of Bureau of Reclamation proposed projects varied from \$140 to \$1,475 an acre, despite considerable doubt that any of the land involved, if provided with a full water supply would have an average market value over \$150 per acre. Any amount spent for construction over that sum would amount to a subsidy.

COSTS IN BILL IN PRESENT FORM

The cost of the proposed storage projects, plus the participating projects, as originally offered in this bill was estimated at approxi-

mately \$1,055 million. By eliminating Echo Park and its recreational area by \$176 million and \$21 million, as well as the fund for Curecanti Dam and Reservoir of \$49 million, and adding to the project \$36 million for the Navajo Dam, plus an overall reduction of 10 percent, we arrive at a cost figure of \$760 million. This method of cost determination to us is unsound. It leaves the actual cost somewhere, but considering all of the provisos, and possibilities of increases as a result of future study, there is no possibility of determining what this cost will be.

This is unrealistic. The bill as the majority reports it commits the Nation to a program of construction the cost of which, to put it mildly, is an unknown amount. This is one reason why we oppose this bill.

COSTS PER ACRE

The Bureau of Reclamation presented cost figures for initial participating projects. Costs allocated to irrigations varied from \$210 to \$794 per acre, or an unweighted average of over \$400 per acre. Little of this land even with sufficient water would command a fair market value as high as this. Costs estimated for some 22 other possible participating projects, on the basis of only partial investigation, run as high or higher, and up to \$1,530 per acre in one instance. We deem these costs excessive and economically unsound.

There exist at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.

The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage. Development costs would be from \$60 to \$100 an acre for such land. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States as follows:

	<i>Acres</i>		<i>Acres</i>
Alabama	683, 000	Missouri	323, 000
Arkansas	1, 865, 000	New York	100, 000
Florida	1, 970, 000	North Carolina	1, 157, 000
Georgia	1, 721, 000	Ohio	95, 000
Illinois	69, 000	Pennsylvania	90, 000
Indiana	135, 000	South Carolina	996, 000
Kentucky	170, 000	Tennessee	242, 000
Louisiana	2, 769, 000	Texas	3, 928, 000
Michigan	690, 000	Virginia	514, 000
Minnesota	874, 000	Wisconsin	316, 000
Mississippi	1, 272, 000		

TESTIMONY AT THE HEARINGS

Testimony of proponents of the Colorado River storage project we feel has been hazy and incomplete.

The program as presented by the Bureau of Reclamation lacks preciseness of detail and accuracy of information.

We are asked to authorize a project consisting of some major storage projects and a varying number of so-called participating projects. The number of these remains unknown despite voluminous testimony. Not even the precise location, size, and dimensions are presented with any degree of exactitude.

We are told that this additional land is needed to produce crops for an anticipated great increase in population within the next quarter of a century while at the same time we are perplexed by the existence of a surplus of a number of the basic crops.

Again we are astonished to hear that this vitally needed agricultural land will not be able to support the cost of the construction, that power to be generated at relatively high cost at the storage dams will pay all of the cost save a diminutive figure of \$82 million of a total of about \$320 million for irrigation costs. It seems strange to us, that 143,000 acres of land getting full irrigation, 243,000 acres getting supplemental water can't do better than that. This is only one-fourth of the cost, and over an indeterminate period of years, something in excess of 50 years.

The project is located in an area where population is 3 persons per square mile, compared to the national average of 51. Where are the consumers of electric power to buy the vast amounts expected to be generated here? What are the inducements offered to newcomers? No evidence has been offered of any new industries or sufficient amounts of domestic power demand to justify this contention.

Most water resource development programs offered to the Congress for approval make use of what is known as the benefit-to-cost ratio, by which it is sought to demonstrate that expected benefits, reasonably demonstrated, will exceed costs. In some borderline cases the national welfare is introduced into the balance. Here in this instance we say the case is not proved and no question of national welfare is involved that does not have a better answer elsewhere.

Here is an attempt to hang a group of projects together, as we see it, some justified and some not, dependent upon an improved source of water supply, to be financed over an excessively long term of years, one-third by water users, two-thirds by power revenues, with a doubtful market for high-cost power, in a thinly settled area, primarily to establish priority of use of such water as may be available. For a project of this nature we cannot in all fairness offer our support.

We suggest that authorization be withheld. At some future date, if proper facts are offered in support of proponent's contentions, we would give further consideration to the project.

EXCESSIVE COST

The bill in its proposed (or present) form amounts to a blank check to a Government construction agency which has been treated overgenerously already in the past. Total costs are unknown, only preliminary and partial studies have been made on most of the participating projects.

Interest charges alone for the full period allowed for repayment are estimated to amount to between \$320 million and \$1,153 million or from about 30 percent to more than 100 percent of the original estimated construction cost. This, of course, will be subject to revision

upward should more participating projects be added, and there are many being talked of, of dubious value to say the least.

Extension of the repayment period to the year 2032 is a departure from precedent and means that it is entirely probable that that year will be beyond the economic life of some of the units.

Almost complete dependence for repayment of the costs of the project upon a system of high-cost hydro projects amounts, in our minds, to fiscal necromancy. There is considerable doubt as to the availability of a ready market for this high-cost power (at 6 mills per kilowatt hour). Sufficient evidence to justify dependence upon this source of revenue for repayment costs has not been presented.

It is doubtful if consumers will utilize and pay the high rates that will be necessary to liquidate the cost of the project, at such high rates as would place project power rates far above that of hydro projects elsewhere. They would necessarily be far above established rates at other reclamation projects.

It is passing strange too, to have such dependence placed on hydropower near the center of the largest coal reserves in the Nation, which need only to be mined to produce steam-generated power to the full extent of any foreseeable demand. The oil shale deposits of the Colorado Plateau are another potential source of energy to compete with this high-cost hydropower.

EFFECT OF ECHO DAM ELIMINATION

The elimination of Echo Park Dam and Reservoir and restriction in size of the Curicante project in our minds weakens considerably the entire project. The already questionable ability of the project to repay its costs is further weakened. The loss of the revenues from power thus eliminated in our minds are alone sufficient to condemn the entire project in its present form.

Echo Park Dam is still in the bill.—The committee voted to strike the controversial Echo Park Dam from the bill. But is it out?

The Desert News of Salt Lake City, Utah, which has been campaigning hard for the project, reported from Washington on the action by the committee:

Backers of the river bill and Echo Park were not dismayed by the Thursday vote. It has long been a part of upper basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope that it will be restored by a joint House-Senate conference committee. Otherwise, House leaders said it would be impossible to get the project bill through the Rules Committee and past the House.

Echo Park is still in the bill because we are advised the project will not work without it. Under Secretary of the Interior, Ralph A. Tudor, testified before the 83d Congress that taking Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado storage project would be like taking the pistons out of the engine of an automobile. The project will not function without Echo Park Dam.

Commissioner of Reclamation, W. A. Dexheimer, testified before the committee this year that the project would not be economically feasible without Echo Park Dam. He stated that the economic feasibility of the project might be established without Echo Park if some of the participating projects also were deleted. However, this was not done by the committee. In other words, the committee sends to the House a bill which the Commissioner of Reclamation conceded would be economically infeasible.

CONCLUSION

Presuming, and it is a rash presumption in our minds, that the project is actually built at present cost estimates, the power is sold at the bus bar at 6 mills (usual revenue from other Federal power projects ranges from 3 to 4 mills) it will still be at least 78 years from start of construction to completion of construction costs. That is under the most favorable conditions.

As against this possibility there are these factors to be weighed. Reasonable doubt cost can be held down to estimate. This is based on past performance. Reasonable doubt as to sales of power reaching expectations. At least reasonable doubts as to the availability of sufficient water supply.

A project which depends for its justification upon information as incomplete and inexact as has been true in this instance is of doubtful value.

We suggest a great deal more study, the development of more precise cost figures, more economic financing arrangements, before we act upon a project of such magnitude.

The bill as offered by the majority of the committee would commit the Nation to a program which may cost up to \$5 billion before it is completed. This is a project of doubtful value and one based upon utilization of water resources about which there is real doubt as to their existence in fact.

JAMES A. HALEY.
GEO. A. SHUFORD.

ADVERSE REPORT ON UPPER COLORADO PROJECT

(To accompany H. R. 3383)

Initial cost

Cost of initial project.....	\$1, 600, 000, 000
Cost to each person in United States.....	10
Cost to each congressional district.....	3, 500, 000

Ultimate cost

Potential minimum cost of ultimate project.....	\$3, 200, 000, 000
Potential cost to each person in the United States.....	20
Potential cost to each congressional district.....	7, 000, 000

Who pays the bill?

Investment by irrigators benefited.....	0
Investment by power companies and consumers.....	0
Investment by upper Colorado States.....	0
Initial investment by taxpayers of United States.....	\$1, 600, 000, 000
Potential investment by United States taxpayers.....	3, 200, 000, 000

Project is financially bankrupt

ALLOCATION OF COSTS

Nonreimbursable, fishing, recreation, flood control.....	\$8, 708, 000
Municipal water.....	72, 275, 000
Power consumers.....	656, 604, 000
Irrigators (farmers).....	915, 372, 000
Total.....	1, 652, 959, 000

ALLOCATION OF REPAYMENTS

- Irrigators to repay (out of irrigation costs of \$915,372,000)..... \$187,787,000 or 20 percent of cost.
- Power consumers to repay (out of power costs of \$656,604,000)..... \$1,456,464,000 or 222 percent of cost.

REPAYMENT PERIOD

Provided for in House bill, S. 500 (substitute) (estimated at 6-mill power rate and 2½ percent interest rate, 4 storage units, 12 participating projects).....	Years 100
Estimated repayment period for 6 storage units, 34 participating projects, at actual 2½ percent interest (no figures available).....	120
Two projects, Gooseberry and Emery(Utah), have estimated repayment periods of over.....	200

United States taxpayers to receive valueless dollars

Purchasing power of dollar in 1905.....	\$1. 00
Purchasing power of dollar today, in 1955.....	. 32
Estimated purchasing power of dollar in 2055 (100 years from now).....	. 05

Sale price of power (6 mills per kilowatt-hour)

Power unit	Cost per mills kilo- watt-hour	Profit or loss
Glen Canyon.....	4.7	+1.3
Echo Park.....	5.9	+.1
Curecanti.....	8.4	-2.4
Flaming Gorge.....	6.4	-.4

Who subsidizes whom?

Number of acres to be newly irrigated.....	506, 000
Number of acres to receive supplemental irrigation.....	406, 000
Number of farms to be irrigated at 100 acres per farm, 3 supplemental irrigated acres equals 1 newly irrigated acre.....farmers..	6, 700
Number of potential electricity consumers.....	750, 000

Subsidy to irrigators by electricity consumers

*Mills per kilowatt
hour*

Wholesale price of electricity under bill.....	6
Cost of electricity at Glen Canyon.....	4.7
750,000 consumers of electricity would subsidize 6,700 farmers to the extent of the differential between the cost (4.7 mills) and the sale price of electricity (6 mills).....	1.3

Subsidy to irrigators by electricity consumers

Cost of irrigation projects.....	\$915, 372, 000
To be repaid by irrigators (6,700 farms).....	187, 787, 000
Direct subsidy by 750,000 electricity consumers to 6,700 farmers..	727, 585, 000

Subsidy by United States taxpayers

The loss in value of dollar due to inflation upon \$1,652,959,000 invested now and to be repaid in average of 50 years; estimated loss about two-thirds of investment.....	\$1, 217, 653, 000
Loss of interest at 3 percent upon irrigation investment of \$187,787,000 repayable by irrigators without interest over an average of 50 years; total 150 percent without compounding interest.....	281, 680, 000

INITIAL COST (\$1.6 BILLION)

The total estimated construction costs for this project is \$1,658,460,100. Based on a United States population of 160 million, the cost would average \$10 for every person in the United States. The cost would average \$3,500,000 for each congressional district with a population of 350,000.

The Senate bill, S. 500, fully or conditionally, authorizes 6 storage units (dams, reservoirs, and hydro plants) and 34 participating (irrigation) projects. The estimated overall construction costs of these projects is \$1,658,460,100.

The House bill, H. R. 3383, was substituted in the House Interior Committee by S. 500. The House bill fully or conditionally authorizes 4 storage units and 34 participating projects. It proposes an authorization of \$760 million. This figure is unrealistic. This estimate was arrived at only for the purpose of making this project a little less unpalatable to the Members of the House.

The bill actually initiates construction on 23 of the 34 participating projects by directing the preparation of detailed designs and specifications for these projects. The cost of these projects was left off the appropriation authorization on the theory that they were merely being "programed." The estimated cost of these 23 projects, amounting to \$570 million, should be added to the estimated authorization of \$760 million.

The House Interior Committee reduced its estimates by arbitrarily cutting 10 percent off the construction costs submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation. It also left off the cost of construction for the Curecanti Dam although it is subject only to a report by the Secretary of the Interior. The arbitrary reduction of the 10 percent and the cost of the Curecanti Dam amounts to \$130 million. The addition of \$130 million and the \$570 million to the \$760 million results in a total cost of \$1,460 million for the projects as authorized by the House bill.

With the prospect of a conference on the Senate and House bills, it is reasonable to count on a total initial construction cost of \$1,658,460,100 for this project.

ULTIMATE COST TO TAXPAYERS (\$3.2 BILLION)

S. 500 and H. R. 3383 would authorize only the "initial phase" of the upper Colorado project. The "ultimate plan" would cost a minimum total of \$3.2 billion or \$1.6 billion additional.

Thus, the potential cost is \$20 per person and \$7 million per congressional district on the average.

The projects included in the present bills are merely the "initial phase" of the proposed upper Colorado storage project. The Senate bill would authorize 6 storage units while the House bill would authorize 4 storage units.

The "ultimate plan" is contained in the report of the Department of the Interior to Congress, April 6, 1954, House Document No. 364, 83d Congress. This "plan" would construct 10 storage units (dams, reservoirs, and powerplants) as compared to the initial phase of 6 storage units in the Senate bill and 4 storage units in the House bill.

The "ultimate plan" for the upper Colorado project lists 100 projects as potential participating irrigation projects. The Senate and House bills would each authorize 34 of these irrigation projects.

The total cost of the additional storage units and irrigation projects contained in the "ultimate plan" is estimated at between \$1.5 billion and \$3 billion. An example of the potential liability is found in the central Utah project. This project is one of the 34 irrigation projects contained in this bill. The initial cost for irrigating 28,000 acres of new land is \$231,044,000. In the comprehensive "ultimate plan," the project would be enlarged to irrigate 200,000 acres of new land. The prorated additional cost for this 1 project will approximate \$1 billion.

A potential liability of \$1,600 million would be a most conservative estimate of the additional cost to the taxpayers to complete the "ultimate plan" over and above the projects authorized by S. 500 and H. R. 3383.

POTENTIAL LIABILITY DUE TO UNDERESTIMATES OF COST

The Bureau of Reclamation issued a report in March 1952 upon the cost increases over original estimates for reclamation projects. This

report upon all projects, dating from 1903 to 1952, showed that the completed project costs averaged 105.7 percent above the original costs estimated by the Reclamation Bureau.

On this basis, it is reasonable to assume that the cost of the "initial phase" of the upper Colorado project will amount to \$3.2 billion rather than the estimated \$1.6 billion.

WHO PAYS THE BILL?

The irrigators who presumably receive the greatest benefits invest nothing in this project.

The power companies would save the original cost of investment in steam plants and purchase power at the cost of generating power in steam plants. They, too, would make no investment of any kind. The power consumers would not be required to furnish any capital.

The four upper Colorado States, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, escape making any investment. The project is designed, primarily, to enable these 4 States to divide the monies produced by water power among the 4 States.

The full cost of \$1.6 billion (potential, \$3.2 billion) is to be borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

PROJECT IS GUARANTEED BANKRUPTCY

This project is hopeless with respect to financial feasibility. In general, the power users and the taxpayers are called upon to subsidize \$915,372,000 of irrigation costs. The farmers would repay at the most optimistic estimates only 20 percent of the costs in inflated dollars over a period of up to 120 years.

The farm repayments total \$187,787,000 to be repaid without interest after a development period of 10 years.

The purchasing power of the dollar has declined from \$1 to \$0.32 in the past 50 years, from 1905 to 1955. Most of this loss of value occurred in the last 25 years. There is an increasing acceleration of inflation and decline in dollar value. No one can reliably foretell the value of the dollar 100 years from now. However, at the present rate of inflation (2 percent per year or more) the value of the dollar 100 years from now would be nearly zero.

AN ECONOMIC CATASTROPHE

AGRICULTURE

	<i>Billions</i>
Agricultural surplus as of May 31, 1955-----	\$4. 89
Agricultural loans on surplus as of May 31, 1955-----	2. 304
Total surplus and loans as of May 31, 1955-----	7. 194

NOTE.—The above figures do not include commitments under law.

This bill would add the production of 506,000 newly irrigated acres and 406,000 supplemental irrigated acres to our agricultural surpluses. The taxpayers and consumers would bear the additional burden of subsidizing this surplus production.

This bill represents a "planned economy" in which production is not to be directed by the demand of the consumer but is planned and directed by our "bureaucratic planners." This bill would commit and

mortgage these lands to an agricultural economy for the next 100 years. The irrigation districts must see to it that all farms continue to produce so that the total repayment costs can be met. This leads to tremendous political pressures for more and more governmental subsidies and agricultural purchases of surpluses.

This increased agricultural production depresses prices for every farmer in the United States. Instead of alleviating our agricultural ills, our problem becomes increasingly acute for both the farmers and out taxpayers.

ELECTRICITY RATES

The rate of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour is an exceedingly high rate for electricity. It compares with a 2.41-mill rate for power sold by the Bonneville Power Administration.

This artificial high cost of power constitutes a penalization of the consumers in the four upper Colorado Basin States. It will foreclose the industrialization of this area and condemn the people of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico to agricultural serfdom for the next 100 years.

COLLOSSAL WASTE OF WATER RESOURCE

Water is one of the precious resources of the Western States. The use of water for irrigation is the most inefficient use that water can be put to.

For example, 1,000 gallons of water will produce 10 cents in value when used for irrigation. For industrial uses the 1,000 gallons of water will produce \$5 in value.

This project would waste precious water for a noneconomic use to produce agricultural surpluses.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL NAVAJO PROJECT

Both the House and Senate versions of S. 500 provide for the construction of a dam and reservoir as a storage unit for the Navajo project.

The cost of the dam is \$36,592,000. It has no powerplant and can only be used for the storage of irrigation water. This authorization commits the United States to a further authorization to complete the Navajo irrigation project. The total cost of this project is estimated to be \$212,037,000.

This project is not proposed as a sound reclamation project. It is submitted as a "relief project" to resettle 1,100 Navajo Indian families upon irrigated lands. It is "planned" to have these families raise fruit and other cultivated crops.

The present income of the Navajo Indian is \$150 per year. The "planners" have not specified who will supply the additional \$10,000 to \$15,000 needed for agricultural machinery. Presumably it will be the United States taxpayer.

A summary of the financial aspects of the Navajo project follows:

Total cost of Navajo project-----	\$212, 037, 300
Navajo families to be resettled-----	1, 100
Investment for 1 Navajo family-----	\$192, 700
Acres to be irrigated-----	137, 250
Cost of irrigation for 1 acre-----	\$1, 540

This project has not been studied or approved by the Bureau of Reclamation. The investigation, findings, and recommendations are made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is specifically stated to be a social project to bring relief to low-income Navajo Indians.

This project would serve to keep the Bureau of Indian Affairs in business for another 100 years. Instead of terminating supervision and guardianship over Indians, this project would tend to perpetuate our supervision over Indians.

It is contrary to the stated policy of Congress to end supervision over Indians as soon as practicable.

CONCLUSION

The upper Colorado reclamation project is an economic folly, a financial bankruptcy, and a sociological tragedy. This bill should be recommitted for the good of everyone concerned.

JOHN R. PILLION,
Member, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States House of Representatives.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3383

[Report No. 1087]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 2, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

JULY 8, 1955

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development
4 of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin,
5 the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority
6 to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce
7 among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make
8 all needful rules and regulations respecting property belong-
9 ing to the United States, and for the purposes, among others,
10 of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water

1 for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the
2 States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the
3 provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportion-
4 ments made to and among them in the Colorado River Com-
5 pact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respec-
6 tively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid
7 land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of
8 navigation, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as
9 an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the
10 Secretary of the Interior *is hereby authorized* (1) to con-
11 struct, operate, and maintain the following initial units
12 of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams,
13 reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appur-
14 tenant works: Curecanti, ~~Echo Park~~, Flaming Gorge, *Navajo*
15 *(dam and reservoir only)*, and Glen Canyon: *Provided,*
16 That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height
17 which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty
18 thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such
19 greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline
20 located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet
21 above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not
22 be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of fur-
23 ther engineering and economic investigations, reexamined
24 the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied
25 by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental

1 report, has certified to the Congress and to the President
2 that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its
3 costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the fol-
4 lowing additional reclamation projects (including power-
5 generating and transmission facilities related thereto), here-
6 inafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah
7 (initial phase), Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La
8 Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam
9 and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with
10 the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary
11 works), Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith
12 Fork, San Juan Chama, Navajo: *Provided*, That (a) no
13 appropriation for or construction of the San Juan-Chama
14 project or the Navajo participating project shall be made or
15 begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been sub-
16 mitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting
17 the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant
18 to the Act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall
19 have been approved and authorized by the Congress: *Pro-*
20 *vided further*, That with reference to the San Juan-Chama
21 project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and
22 reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used
23 solely for the control and regulation of water imported
24 from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be
25 established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on

1 the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all
2 times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the De-
3 partment of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio
4 Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Com-
5 pact Commission.

6 SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive develop-
7 ment as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the
8 Upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado
9 River System the use of which is apportioned to the Upper
10 Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and
11 to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin
12 Compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to
13 authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of
14 further units of the Colorado River storage project, of addi-
15 tional phases of participating projects authorized in this
16 Act, and of new participating projects as additional informa-
17 tion becomes available and additional needs are indicated.
18 It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to
19 authorize as participating projects only projects (including
20 units or phases thereof)—

21 (1) for the use, in one or more of the States desig-
22 nated in article III of the Upper Colorado River Basin
23 Compact, of waters of the Upper Colorado River system
24 the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those
25 States by that article; and

1 ~~(2)~~ for which pertinent data sufficient to determine
2 their probable engineering and economic justification
3 and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared
4 to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any
5 participating project authorized in the future shall be
6 amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent con-
7 sistent with the provisions of this Act and Federal
8 reclamation law.

9 *SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects*
10 *under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado*
11 *River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of*
12 *planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama,*
13 *Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide,*
14 *Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa,*
15 *Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa,*
16 *Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot*
17 *Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata,*
18 *and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be*
19 *completed as expeditiously as funds are made available there-*
20 *for and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and*
21 *thereafter to the President and the Congress: Provided, That*
22 *with reference to the plans and specifications for the San*
23 *Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation*
24 *of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be*
25 *limited to a single off-stream dam and reservoir on a tributary*

1 of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and
2 regulation and no power facilities shall be established, in-
3 stalled or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times
4 by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the In-
5 terior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as
6 administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The
7 preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the
8 works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects
9 shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof
10 indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

11 SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing
12 only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in
13 authorizing priority in planning only those additional proj-
14 ects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or
15 otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as
16 will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper
17 Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is appor-
18 tioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado
19 River Compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colo-
20 rado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration
21 and authorization by the Congress of additional projects un-
22 der the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are
23 indicated.

24 SEC. 3 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in
25 constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the

1 Colorado River storage project and the participating projects
2 listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed
3 by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902,
4 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary
5 thereto) : *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts
6 shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided
7 for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of
8 the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project
9 contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years
10 exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b)
11 prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities,
12 repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as
13 defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act
14 of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy
15 assessments upon all taxable real property located within its
16 boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a
17 substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by
18 the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water
19 supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the
20 last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act
21 of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served
22 by any participating project, payment of construction costs
23 within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to
24 the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and
25 participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments

1 of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins
2 of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper
3 Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper
4 Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms
5 of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series
6 994).

7 SEC. 4 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate
8 fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as
9 the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred
10 to as the "Basin Fund"), which shall remain available until
11 expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions
12 of this Act other than section 7 8.

13 (b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carry-
14 ing out the provisions of this Act, other than section 7 8,
15 shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the
16 general fund of the Treasury.

17 (c) All revenues collected in connection with the oper-
18 ation of the Colorado River storage project and participating
19 projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be
20 available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying
21 the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of,
22 and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado
23 River storage project and participating projects, within such
24 separate limitations as may be included in annual appro-
25 priation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d)

1 of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction
2 costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability
3 of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in
4 the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment
5 to be made within fifty years after completion of that por-
6 tion of the project which has not been constructed as of
7 the date of this Act, and (4) payment in connection with
8 the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in
9 the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277) : *Provided*, That
10 revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available
11 for appropriation for construction of the units and partici-
12 pating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

13 (d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating
14 needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the
15 Treasury to return—

16 (1) the costs of each unit, participating project,
17 or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
18 power pursuant to section 5 6 of this Act, within a
19 period of years not exceeding the expected economic
20 life of such unit or participating project but not to ex-
21 ceed one hundred years;

22 (2) the costs of each unit, participating project,
23 or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
24 municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 6 of this

1 Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the
2 date of completion of such unit, participating project, or
3 separable feature thereof;

4 (3) interest on the unamortized balance of the in-
5 vestment (including interest during construction) in the
6 power and municipal water supply features of each
7 unit, participating project, or any separable feature
8 thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the
9 Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest
10 due shall be a first charge; and

11 (4) the costs of each unit, participating project,
12 or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to
13 irrigation pursuant to section 5 6 of this Act in equal
14 annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty
15 years, in addition to any development period authorized
16 by law, from the date of completion of such unit, par-
17 ticipating project, or separable feature thereof, or, in the
18 cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within
19 a period consistent with other provisions of law ap-
20 plicable thereto.

21 (e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the
22 storage project and each participating project shall be de-
23 termined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time
24 the first advance is made for initiating construction of said
25 unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by

1 calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of
2 daily closing market bid quotations during the month of
3 June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is
4 made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obliga-
5 tions of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen
6 or more years from the first day of said month, and by ad-
7 justing such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth
8 of 1 per centum.

9 (f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the
10 Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin
11 Fund.

12 SEC. 5 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating
13 project or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall
14 allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures au-
15 thorized by section 7 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit,
16 project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water
17 supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes
18 authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construc-
19 tion, operation and maintenance costs to authorized non-
20 reimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the
21 provisions of this Act. On January 1 of each year the
22 Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous
23 fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, upon the
24 status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing,
25 operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage proj-

1 ect and the participating projects. The Secretary's report
2 shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment
3 allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other
4 purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon,
5 and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accom-
6 plishing full repayment.

7 SEC. 6 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by
8 this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by
9 the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other
10 Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce
11 the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that
12 can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exer-
13 cise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere
14 with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River
15 Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the
16 Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project
17 Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into
18 under said Acts without the consent of the other contracting
19 parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for
20 the generation of power and energy at the plants of the
21 Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the
22 appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant
23 to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States
24 of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

25 SEC. 7 8. In connection with the development of the

1 Colorado River storage project and of the participating
2 projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investi-
3 gate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public
4 recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the
5 development of said project or of said participating projects,
6 to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic
7 objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for
8 public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water
9 areas created by these projects by such means as are con-
10 sistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2)
11 facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the
12 propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized
13 to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry
14 or other disposition under the public land laws necessary
15 for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the
16 facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal,
17 State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer,
18 exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions
19 as will best promote their development and operation in
20 the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this
21 section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

22 SEC. 8 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be con-
23 strued to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or
24 be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Proj-
25 ect Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Ad-

1 justment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact,
2 the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande
3 Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican
4 States (Treaty Series 994).

5 SEC. 9 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen
6 Canyon, Curecanti, and ~~Echo Park~~ Navajo initial units of
7 the Colorado River storage project may be made without
8 regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements
9 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

10 SEC. 10 11. Construction of the projects herein author-
11 ized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary
12 requirements and the economic needs of the country.

13 SEC. 11 12. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
14 priated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise
15 appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out
16 the purpose of this Act, but not to exceed ~~\$1,055,000,000~~
17 \$760,000,000.

18 SEC. 13. *The Secretary of the Interior of the United*
19 *States is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with*
20 *the city and county of Denver, Colorado, or any other mu-*
21 *nicipality or governmental subdivision in the State of Colo-*
22 *rado, on the procedure for and the feasibility of a program*
23 *which would authorize the said Secretary of the Interior*
24 *to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colorado, or*
25 *any other municipality or governmental subdivision in the*

1 *State of Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally*
2 *owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights*
3 *used or acquired by the United States solely for the genera-*
4 *tion of power, and such other property of the United States*
5 *as shall be required in connection with the development or*
6 *use of such municipal water system. The said Secretary of*
7 *the Interior shall report his findings and recommendations*
8 *to the Congress of the United States as soon as possible,*
9 *but not later than March 1, 1956: Provided, That in mak-*
10 *ing his report the said Secretary of the Interior shall recom-*
11 *mend a formula governing the charges to be made for any*
12 *such conveyance.*

13 SEC. ~~12~~ 14. In planning the additional development
14 necessary to the full consumptive use in the Upper Basin of
15 the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the
16 Upper Basin and in planning the use of and in using credits
17 from net power revenues available for the purpose of
18 assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects
19 herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado,
20 New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall
21 have regard for the achievement within each of such
22 States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the
23 waters of the Upper Colorado River system consistent with
24 the apportionment thereof among such States.

25 SEC. ~~13~~ 15. In the operation and maintenance of all fa-

1 cilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction
2 and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin
3 of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is di-
4 rected to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colo-
5 rado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the
6 Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty
7 with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release
8 of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In
9 the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to
10 so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may main-
11 tain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to
12 enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given
13 to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit
14 or suits.

15 SEC. ~~44~~ 16. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to
16 institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and
17 to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon
18 the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all trans-
19 mountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system
20 and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the
21 Colorado River Basin.

22 SEC. ~~45~~ 17. As used in this Act—

23 The terms “Colorado River Basin”, “Colorado River
24 Compact”, “Colorado River system”, “Lee Ferry”, “States
25 of the Upper Division”, “Upper Basin”, and “domestic use”

1 shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the
2 Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

3 The term "States of the Upper Colorado River Basin"
4 shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico,
5 Utah, and Wyoming;

6 The term "Upper Colorado River Basin" shall have
7 the same meaning as the term "Upper Basin";

8 The term "Upper Colorado River Basin Compact" shall
9 mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948,
10 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colo-
11 rado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to
12 by the Congress of the United States of America by Act
13 of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31) ;

14 The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that cer-
15 tain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners
16 representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas
17 and consented to by the Congress of the United States of
18 America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785) ;

19 The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall
20 mean that certain treaty between the United States of
21 America and the United Mexican States signed at Wash-
22 ington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating
23 to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and
24 other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol
25 dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited

1 in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and
2 consenting to ratification thereof; and

3 The term "economic life," as used herein in relation
4 to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the
5 period during which the unit or project is expected to con-
6 tinue to provide the power and energy contemplated from
7 the design and construction of the power facilities of the
8 unit or project, due regard being given to historical ex-
9 perience with similar types of works, allowances included
10 in "replacement costs" for replacing major items of equip-
11 ment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the
12 useful life.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3383

[Report No. 1087]

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASPINALL

FEBRUARY 2, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

JULY 8, 1955

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

H. R. 3383

(Passed the House)

A BILL.

To amend the Act relating to the Administration of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

OF THE HOUSE

OF REPRESENTATIVES

IN CONGRESS

ASSEMBLED

IN SENATE, JANUARY 1, 1917.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 22, 1955
For actions of July 21, 1955
84th-1st, No. 123

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....14	Health.....27	Reserve forces.....1,13
Apple prices.....31	Housing.....13	Rice.....15
Appropriations.....19	Immigration.....33	Roads.....10,13
C.C.C.....15,17,29	Labor, farm.....15	Security.....4
Contracts.....2	Lands.....15	Small business.....13
Defense production...11,13	Legislative program..13,24	Social security.....35
Education.....5	Minerals.....3	Sugar.....6
Electrification.....8,38	Minimum wage.....21,34	Surplus commodities....12
Employee exchange.....16	On-farm training.....5	Surplus property.....23
Fabrics.....9	Personnel.....26	Textiles.....37
Food and drugs.....32	Price supports.....22	Tobacco.....15
Foreign aid.....19,36	Printing.....7	Veterans benefits.....5
Foreign trade.....12,25	Reclamation.....8,13,18,38	Water compact.....20
Forestry.....28	Research.....9,27	Water resources.....30

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee ordered reported sugar bill. Senate passed bill to exchange USDA and State employees. Senate received proposed legislation and bill was introduced in the House providing for increase in CCC borrowing authority. Senate committees reported bills to authorize loans to small reclamation projects, permit sales of certain CCC stocks without restriction, transfer title 3 lands to Clemson College, amend rice quota law, extend Mexican farm labor program, authorize CCC to process foods for donation, and amend tobacco allotments-quotas law.

HOUSE

1. **RESERVE FORCES.** Received the conference report on H. R. 7000, the reserve forces bill (H. Rept. 1335)(pp. 9601-5).
2. **CONTRACTS.** Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4904, to extend the Renegotiation Act for two years (pp. 9605-6). This bill is now ready for the President.
3. **MINERALS.** Passed with amendments H. R. 6373, extending the Domestic Minerals Program Act to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals (pp. 9610, 9619-29). The amendments agreed to related to the production of manganese and the establishment of a purchasing depot.
4. **GOVERNMENT SECURITY.** Conferees were appointed on H. J. Res. 157, to establish a Commission on Government Security (p. 9630). Senate conferees have been appointed.
5. **FARM TRAINING.** The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 4006, to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training (p. 9649).

6. SUGAR. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported by a vote of 24 to 7, with amendments, H. R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 (p. D755).
7. PRINTING. The House Administration Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 272, providing \$65,000 for a study and investigation of Federal printing and binding (H. Rept. 1312)(p. 9649).
8. RECLAMATION; ELECTRIFICATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the Colorado River storage project (p. 9649).
9. FABRICS; RESEARCH. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5222, amending the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt scarves which do not present an unusual hazard from its provisions (p. 9649).
10. ROADS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7474, providing for a Federal-aid highway construction program (H. Rept. 1336)(p. 9649).
11. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7470, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 (H. Rept. 1343)(p. 9649).
12. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Allen, Calif., urged consideration of the use of the idle ships in the American merchant marine as storage for surplus grains and to continue the Cargo Preference provisions (pp. 9645-6).
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Majority Leader scheduled consideration on Mon., July 25, of the conference report on H. R. 7000, the reserve forces bill, and consideration of the following bills on Tues., July 26, through Sat., July 30 was scheduled providing rules are received; H. R. 3383, the Upper Colorado Storage project; S. 2127, the Small Business Administration bill; H. R. 7470, extension of the Defense Production Act; S. 2126, the housing bill; and H. R. 7474, the Federal-aid highway construction bill (pp. 9629-30).
14. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 25 (p. 9648).

SENATE

15. CCC STOCKS; LANDS; RICE; FARM LABOR; TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported during adjournment on July 20, with amendment S. 1621, authorizing adjustment of certain obligations of farm settlers (S. Rept. 1042); S. 2297, national marketing quota for tobacco (S. Rept. 1043); S. 2170, to permit sale of CCC stocks of basic and storable nonbasic agricultural commodities without restriction where similar commodities are exported in raw or processed form (S. Rept. 1047); and H. R. 4280, to transfer certain title 3 lands to Clemson College (S. Rept. 1048); and with amendment H. R. 3822, to extend the Mexican farm labor program (S. Rept. 1045); S. 661, to authorize CCC to process food commodities for donation under certain acts (S. Rept. 1049); and S. 2295 and S. 2296, to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments (S. Repts. 1044 and 1046)(p. 9567).
16. EXCHANGE OF EMPLOYEES. Passed without amendment S. 1915, to provide for interchange of employees by this Department and State and local governments (pp. 9591-2). The bill had been reported without amendment during adjournment on July 20 (S. Rept. 1041)(p. 9567). Sen. Clements stated that "Senate bill

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 3383

JULY 21, 1955.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 311]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 311, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 125

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 311

[Report No. 1332]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 21, 1955

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to
5 authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate,
6 and maintain the Colorado River storage project and partici-
7 pating projects, and for other purposes. After general de-
8 bate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue
9 not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled
10 by the chairman and ranking minority member of the
11 Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be
12 read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the

1 conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment,
 2 the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House
 3 with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the
 4 previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill
 5 and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening
 6 motion except one motion to recommit.

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COLMER

JULY 21, 1935

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
 printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued February 9, 1956
For actions of February 8, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 22

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....17	Grain storage.....36	Price supports.....21
Agricultural production.....37	G.S.A.....7	Property.....37
Appropriations.....1,9	Hog prices.....15	Public Works.....18
Atomic energy.....14	Housing.....28	R.E.A.....19
Brucellosis.....12,44	Immigration.....2,31,34	Reclamation.....5,18,40
Conservation.....1,30	Information.....32	Research.....1,22
Disaster relief.....26,38	Loans.....1,38	Roads.....4,24
Economic report.....25	Livestock.....37	School milk.....12,44
Electrification.....19	Mining.....11	Sugar.....6
Exhibits.....32	Mosquitoes.....22	Tobacco.....10,41
Family farms.....20	Natural resources.....42	Transportation.....27
Farm prices.....23	Nomination.....7	Water, conservation.....8
Farm program.....15,21	Organization.....28	pollution.....29
Foreign trade.....3,33	Patents.....13	Watersheds.....39
Forestry.....1,11,16	Personnel.....35	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to amend and extend Sugar Act. Senate passed bill to increase school milk and brucellosis programs. Senate Committee reported urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1956. Senate committee reported measures to increase allotments on burley, Maryland, and fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco. Both Houses received President's message on immigration and naturalization. House received supplemental appropriation estimates for 1956.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimates for the fiscal year 1956 (H. Doc. 330); to Appropriations Committee. (p. 2106)

The estimates include funds for Pay Act costs applicable to the agencies for which other supplementals are requested, as follows:

Agricultural Research Service:

Emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases
(contingency fund) 500,000
Pay Act costs 4,294,000

Forest Service:

Fighting forest fires 5,250,000
Administration of timber sales 500,000
Pay Act costs 2,463,500

Commodity Credit Corporation:

Administrative-expense limitation (including
\$1,716,877 for Pay Act costs) 4,964,000

Farmers' Home Administration:

Farm housing loans 5,000,000
Salaries and expenses, for housing loans 150,000
Pay Act costs 1,470,000

Agricultural Conservation Program Service:

Language to extend to Dec. 31, 1956, availability of
unobligated balances for measures to restore lands
damaged by floods and hurricanes and for wind
erosion control practices.

\$24,591,500

2. IMMIGRATION. Both Houses received the President's message on immigration and naturalization (H. Doc. 329) (pp. 2029, 2061). Various Sens. and Reps. commented favorably on the message. pp. 1998, 2064, 2101.
3. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Cooper inserted letters from the Executive Branch advising U. S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. p. 2078
Rep. Bailey registered opposition to U. S. membership in OTC and alleged that the State Department was misleading in its explanation of the functions of that organization. p. 2100
Received from the U. S. Tariff Commission the annual report of the operations of the trade-agreements program. p. 2106
4. ROADS. Rep. Cooper inserted press releases from his office and that of Rep. Boggs urging support of H. R. 9075, to provide revenue for the financing of the Federal highway construction program. p. 2079
5. RECLAMATION. Received from the Interior Department reports on the Ainsworth unit, Neb., Missouri River Basin project (H. Doc. 331), and the Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District. p. 2106
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported H. R. 6268, to provide for the use of appropriated funds by the Secretary of Interior in contracts for the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation projects; tabled H. R. 8749 and H. R. 9132, to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, and ordered reported a clean bill on the subject; and (the Daily Digest stated) "adopted a substitute amendment to H. R. 3383, the Colo. River storage project bill, which will be reported not later than Feb. 11" p. 2107

SENATE

6. SUGAR. Passed with ^{amendments} H. R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, accepting the Committee amendment which was in the nature of a substitute to the House bill. Senators Byrd, George, Kerr, Martin (Pa.) and Bennett were appointed conferees on the bill. pp. 1998, 2025. (See continuation on page 6.)
7. NOMINATION. Received from the President the nomination of Franklin G. Flete to be Administrator of the General Services Administration. p. 1963
8. WATER CONSERVATION. Sen. Langer inserted a resolution adopted by the N. Dak. State Water Conservation Commission favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the operation and maintenance of an irrigation development farm in N. Dak. p. 1964
9. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 9063, making urgent deficiency appropriations for 1956 (S. Rept. 1476). p. 1965
10. TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. J. Resolutions 111 and 141, to increase allotments and quotas of burley and Maryland tobacco respectively (S. Repts. 1477 and 1478); and S. J. Res. 136 with amendments to increase allotments and quotas of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco (S. Rept. 1479). p. 1965

Institution of Washington, D. C., and Willard Bascom, technical director, Civil Defense Advisory Committee, National Academy of Sciences, on civil defense. Both witnesses deplored the deficiency in the area of technical research in the present program and expressed doubt as to the adequacy of the Federal Civil Defense Administration to meet the need for increased technical research.

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Adopted a substitute amendment to H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project bill, which will be reported not later than February 14.

Tabled H. R. 5749 and H. R. 9132, to provide for the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, a clean bill was ordered favorably reported to the House.

Also ordered the following bills reported favorably to the House:

H. R. 6904, to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument;

H. R. 8728, to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 5310, to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.; and

H. R. 6268, to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications held hearings on bills to amend the Communications Act of 1934. Representative Dorn and Robert Heald, chief attorney, National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, testified. Permission was granted the National Broadcasting Co. to insert a statement in the record. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

HEALTH PROBLEMS

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Health and Science held hearings on international health problems. Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General, testified regarding the role of the Public Health Service abroad and internationally; Dr. H. Van Zile Hyde, Chief, Division of International Health, Dr. Calvin B. Spencer, Chief, Division of Foreign Quarantine, Public Health Service, and Otis E. Mulliken, Officer in Charge of Social Affairs, Department of State, were also heard.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 2 held hearings on the following bills, all related to the Federal Construction Contract Act: S. 1644, H. R. 7637, 7638, 7668, 7676, 7686, and 7693. Representative Cunningham; Brig. Gen. B. H. Tulley, Department of Defense; Roger W. Fulling, Director of Construction, Office of Secretary of Defense; and James S. Binder, Little Rock, Ark., representing the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, were heard. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

CARGO PREFERENCE ACT

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Continued review of administration and operation of Cargo Preference Act. Heard Bernt Lund, president, accompanied by C. A. Olsen, shipping secretary, Norwegian Shipowners Association. Will continue hearings 10 a. m., Thursday.

HIGHWAYS

Committee on Public Works: Fallon subcommittee in executive session heard Rex M. Whitten, president, Association of State Highway Officials, on H. R. 8836, to authorize appropriations for continuing construction of highways. Subcommittee adjourned until February 21.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Heard Harvey V. Higley, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, and Fred A. McNamara, Bureau of the Budget, in regard to a long-range program for construction of veterans' hospitals.

Joint Committee Meetings

ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Committee concluded its hearings on the development, state, and growth of the atomic energy industry, and on the report of the panel on the impact of peaceful uses of atomic energy. Witnesses heard today were Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman; Dr. W. F. Libby, Thomas E. Murray, and Harold S. Vance, all members; K. E. Fields, General Manager; Dr. Charles L. Dunham, Director, Division of Biology and Medicine; Harold L. Price, Director, Division of Civilian Application; and William Mitchell, General Counsel, all of the Atomic Energy Commission.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: Continuing its hearings on the President's economic report, the committee heard testimony on monetary policy recommendations in the report from Marriner S. Eccles, First Security Bank, Salt Lake City, Utah. Hearings continue tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 9

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, executive, to vote on farm bill, 10 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction, on S. 3122, military public works bill, 10 a. m., 212 Senate Office Building; Subcommittee To Review the Operations of Article VII of Status of Forces Treaty (Senators Ervin, chairman, and Flanders), 10 a. m., 412 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Finance, on H. R. 7225, social security amendments of 1955, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Retirement Subcommittee, on S. 2875, to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, 10 a. m., 135 Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Acquisitions and Disposals, executive, on military real-estate projects, 10 a. m., 304 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, on flood and disaster insurance program, representatives of U. S. Chamber of Commerce and CIO-AFL to be heard, 10 a. m., 1301 New House Office Building.

Committee on District of Columbia, Davis of Georgia subcommittee on H. R. 8130, to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge; and H. R. 8988, to clarify the authority of the Commissioners with respect to the discipline of officers and members of the Police and Fire Departments, 10 a. m., 445 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, executive, to hear Henry F. Holland, Assistant Sec-

retary of State for Inter-American Affairs; and Viron Vaky, Officer in Charge of Argentine Desk, Department of State, 10:30 a. m., G-3 Capitol Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Military Operations to hear Dr. James Killian, Jr., president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, on civil defense, 10 a. m., 1501 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on following bills, all related to Indian problems: H. R. 6990, 8607, 6076, 6084, 4604, 6374, 5478, 3544, 3602, 5838, 6154, and 7190, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Science to continue hearings on international health problems, 10 a. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications to resume hearings on civil air policy and H. R. 4648 and H. R. 4677, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, 10:15 a. m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 3 on H. R. 317, relating to judicial review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, 10:30 a. m., 346 Old House Office Building.

Special Subcommittee on Study of Presidential Inability, executive, 10:30 a. m., 347 Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 1, executive, 10 a. m., 327 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to continue review of operation and administration of Cargo Preference Act, 10 a. m., 219 Old House Office Building.

Joint Committees

Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on President's economic report—agricultural policy, to hear Murray D. Lincoln, Cooperative League of the U. S., Columbus, Ohio, to be followed by executive session on committee business, 10 a. m., room P-63, Capitol.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued February 15, 1956

For actions of February 14, 1956

84th-2nd, No. 25

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Accounting.....	35	Electrification.....	26	Personnel.....	2,36,47
ACP.....	13	Farm credit.....	46	Price supports	
Acreage allotments.....	44	Farm program...12,14,24,50		12,14,23,44,50	
Adjournment.....	6,19	Flood control.....	9	Property.....	15,31
Agricultural		Foreign trade.....	18	Reclamation.....	3,5,8,27
production.....	41,42	Forestry.....	17,30,41	Research.....	10,40
Alaska.....	4,43	Hogs.....	33	Soil bank.....	12,23,28
Appropriations.....	1,17,20	Housing.....	32,48	Soil conservation....	13,28
ARS.....	10	Insect control.....	11,40	Sugar.....	12
Bankruptcy.....	39	International		Surplus commodities....	22
Budgeting.....	35	organizations.....	7	Taxation.....	11
Compensating commercial		Irrigation.....	8	Tobacco.....	16,44
banks.....	20	Laws.....	45	Transportation.....	22,49
Corn.....	44	Legislative program...5,16		Veterans' benefits.....	37
Cotton.....	44	Livestock.....	12,14,34	Water resources.....	21
Disbursements.....	20	Marketing.....	33	Wheat.....	44
Education.....	38	Mining.....	25	Wildlife.....	29

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to Senate amendments to urgent deficiency appropriation bill. Sen. Humphrey criticized Secretary's comments on "Full Prosperity for Agriculture" pamphlet. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to provide incentive payments for marketing of lightweight hogs. Sen. Payne and others introduced and Sen. Payne discussed bill to improve governmental budgeting and accounting procedures. Rep. Miller, Neb., introduced and discussed bill to stimulate industrial use of farm commodities.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 9063, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1956. (p. 2223) This bill is now ready for the President
2. PERSONNEL. Rep. Zablocki spoke in favor of his bill H. R. 8002, to establish uniform appeals rights for Federal employees. p. 2224
3. RECLAMATION. Rep. Edmondson urged that action be taken to provide for the further development of water transportation, flood control, and conservation facilities in the Arkansas River Basin. He alleged that the Bureau of the Budget was failing to pursue the completion of this project and thereby thwarting the will of Congress. p. 2237

Rep. Fernandez requested that favorable consideration be given the bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project. p. 2246

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee submitted a supplemental report on H. R. 3383, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project (H. Rept. 1087, Pt. 2), and reported without amendment H. R. 9132, to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary

of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project (H. Rept. 1764). (p. 2258) On Feb. 13, the committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1529, to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and H. R. 5975, to reimburse owners of lands acquired under Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses. p. D119

4. ALASKA. Rep. Bartlett inserted the proposed constitution of the "future State of Alaska." p. 2247

5. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Majority Leader announced that consideration of S. 926, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Ventura River reclamation project, would be scheduled for Thurs., Feb. 16. p. 2223

6. ADJOURNED until Thurs., Feb. 16. pp. 2223, 2258

SENATE

7. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. Both Houses received a Dept. of State report of U. S. contributions to international organizations for 1955. pp. 2191, 2258

8. IRRIGATION. Both Houses received an Interior report stating that lands in the Meeker-Driftwood unit of the Missouri Basin are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation. pp. 2191, 2258

9. FLOOD CONTROL. Received a resolution from the Calif. Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for flood control on Kaweah and Tule Rivers. p. 2192

10. RESEARCH. Sen. Langer inserted a resolution of the N. Dak. Garrison Diversion Conservancy District urging increased appropriations for ARS in North Dakota for the Sheyenne development farm. p. 2192

11. INSECTS; TAXES. Sen. Thye inserted two resolutions of the Minn. Agricultural Laws Study Commission urging eradication of the gypsy moth, and elimination of the Federal tax on gasoline used on the farm. p. 2193

12. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Thye inserted a series of resolutions adopted by a group of farmers in the Minn. Red River Valley relating to parity, the Soil Bank, imports, sugar, livestock, etc. p. 2193

Sen. Bible inserted a recent address by Sen. Anderson before the Democratic National Committee on the "plight of the Nation's agriculture". p. 2212

Sen. Humphrey criticized the remarks of the Secretary on a pamphlet, "Full Prosperity for Agriculture," and inserted a letter he had written to the Secretary on the matter. p. 2204

13. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Carlson inserted five resolutions adopted by the Kansas Watersheds Assoc. urging increased appropriations for and payments by ACP, and supporting an improved program of water and soil conservation. p. 2194

14. LIVESTOCK; PRICES. Sen. Humphrey submitted two amendments which he intends to propose to the farm bill (S. 3183) to provide incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter-than-normal weights, and inserted a press release he had prepared on the subject. p. 2201

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT,
OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE
PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
submitted the following

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3383]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The committee reported favorably on H. R. 3383 with amendments on July 8, 1955, and recommended its passage. The committee's explanation of that bill and the committee's conclusions and recommendations are embodied in House Report No. 1087.

Subsequent to submission of H. R. 3383 and the report thereon, concern was expressed in some quarters relative to certain features of the proposed legislation: first, as to the effect of project construction and operation on scenic, recreational, and related resources of the upper basin area; second, as to the desirability of spelling out in greater detail the accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund, as well as certain general procedural requirements.

During the recess of Congress, and following reconvening for the second session, committee members communicated with interested individuals and groups for the purpose of determining the desirability of further considering the committee-proposed amendments reported to the House on July 8, 1955. Thereafter, it was concluded that any further amendments to be proposed might best be presented for consideration on the floor if incorporated in a supplemental report. Unanimous consent to file such a report was obtained on February 7, 1956.

Having considered further amendments, and having adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute bill incorporating such amendments as are deemed responsive to questions raised since filing of its initial report, the committee recommends that all language after the enacting clause of H. R. 3383, as reported on July 8, 1955, be stricken, and the following substituted therefor:

That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Florida, Hammond, LaBarge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single off-stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit.

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use

of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "basin fund"), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed one hundred years;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty years.

(e) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the upper division in the following percentages: Colorado 46 per centum; Utah 21.5 per centum; Wyoming 15.5 per centum; and New Mexico 17 per centum: *Provided*, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the basin fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act, (2) costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the basin fund.

SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said Acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic

or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navaho initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the oil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this Act, but not to exceed \$760,000,000.

SEC. 13. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 16. As used in this Act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin", "Colorado River Compact", "Colorado River system", "Lee Ferry", "States of the upper division", "upper basin", and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

The term "States of the Upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "upper basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

The term "economic life", as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in "replacement costs" for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life.

EXPLANATION OF CHANGES

The changes in the bill that was reported on July 8, with committee-recommended amendments as set out in Union Calendar Print No. 317, are shown hereinafter by striking through the language to be deleted and inserting in *italic* the language added. The amendments are numbered for clarity in the explanations which follow:

A BILL To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Florida, Hammond, LaBarge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, and Smith Fork: [1]

Provided further, That as part of the Glen Canyon Unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, [2] ~~Woody Creek~~, *San Miguel*, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata, [3] *Yellow Jacket*, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single off-stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

[4] *In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti Unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper Unit.*

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. [5] *It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.*

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed hereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932, 47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Basin Fund"), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: [6] *Provided, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project;* (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; [7] ~~(3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 481), said payment to be made within fifty years after completion of that portion of the project which has not been constructed as of the date of this Act, and~~ (4) payment in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277). *Provided, That and* (5) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed one hundred years;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

[8] ~~(4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty years; in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof; or, in the cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.~~

(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty years.

[9] (c) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the Upper Division in the following percentages: Colorado 46%; Utah 21.5%; Wyoming 15.5%; and New Mexico 17%. *Provided, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.*

Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding fifty years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of

completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act, (2) costs of the Paonia Project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden Project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

(e) (f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceeding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(f) (g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. [10] *Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be non-reimbursable.* On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said Acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder

Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this Act, but not to exceed \$760,000,000.

[11] SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Interior of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with the city and county of Denver, Colorado, or any other municipality or governmental subdivision in the State of Colorado, on the procedure for and the feasibility of a program which would authorize the said Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colorado, or any other municipality or governmental subdivision in the State of Colorado, for use as a part of its municipally owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power, and such other property of the United States as shall be required in connection with the development or use of such municipal water system. The said Secretary of the Interior shall report his findings and recommendations to the Congress of the United States as soon as possible, but not later than March 1, 1956: Provided, That in making his report the said Secretary of the Interior shall recommend a formula governing the charges to be made for any such conveyance.

SEC. 14. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the Upper Basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the Upper Basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

SEC. 15. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

SEC. 16. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all trans-mountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 17. As used in this Act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin", "Colorado River Compact", "Colorado River system", "Lee Ferry", "States of the Upper Division", "Upper Basin", and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

The term "States of the Upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "Upper Basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexi-

co, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

The term "economic life," as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in "replacement costs" for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life.

[1] and [5]. Amendments No. 1 and No. 5 were recommended by the conservationist groups. The inclusion of these amendments makes the legislation acceptable to these groups as indicated by the following letter to the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee:

JANUARY 23, 1956.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: Congressmen from the upper Colorado Basin States and prospective Senate conferees have guaranteed the Nation's conservationists that the Echo Park Dam "will not be reinserted" into the upper Colorado bill when it comes up for action in this session of Congress, and the administration has also reversed its former stand on this matter and has agreed to drop the Echo Park proposal.

Furthermore, we have now been assured that the following two provisos will be added, in their appropriate places, to H. R. 3383 when it reaches the floor of the House and that Senator Anderson and other prospective Senate conferees will support the inclusion of these two provisos:

1. *Provided further*, That as part of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

2. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

In view of these agreements we no longer oppose this bill. In fact, we also wish to commend the proponents of the project for the addition of these provisos, which we are glad to support as of great positive value to the cause of conservation, for they are a reaffirmation of the national park principle at a time when the national park system, in the minds of many, is in serious danger.

We who have led the fight against the Echo Park Dam are accordingly pleased to be able to take our present position.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT,
Trustees for Conservation.

IRA N. GABRIELSON,
Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources.

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Council of Conservationists.

The committee has received similar letters from the following: American Nature Association, the American Forestry Association, National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, National Parks Association, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Sierra Club, Wildlife Management Institute, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Conservation Education Association, and National Audubon Society.

Amendment No. 1 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from impairment by construction of the Glen Canyon unit. Although the committee understands that the Department's plan for the Glen Canyon unit already calls for such protection, this amendment assures that the necessary protective works will be constructed. Amendment No. 5 puts into language the position which the committee has previously taken by its deletion of Echo Park from the units authorized to be constructed.

[2]. Amendment No. 2 deletes the Woody Creek project in Colorado from those projects which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning further developments in the upper basin and inserts in lieu thereof the San Miguel project, also in Colorado. This amendment seems desirable as it was found that the people who would be served by the Woody Creek project were not favorable to its development as a Federal project, while there is a great deal of local interest in the completion of a report and eventual construction of the San Miguel project.

[3]. Amendment No. 3 adds the Yellow Jacket project in northwestern Colorado to those which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning further developments. It is in the watershed of the Yampa and White Rivers and development in that area is very much needed. With respect to both of these amendments, it is pointed out that this legislation only authorizes studies and investigations and that these projects will require authorization by the Congress before construction can be undertaken.

[4]. Amendment No. 4 requires the Secretary of the Interior to give priority to completion of studies and a report on the Juniper unit in the event he finds the Curecanti unit infeasible. The authorization of the Curecanti unit in this legislation is subject to a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that, on the basis of detailed studies now underway, the unit is feasible. If the Secretary determines that the Curecanti unit is not feasible, this amendment requires him to then give priority to study of the Juniper unit. However, again, it is only the study and planning report that is authorized in this legislation and further authorization by the Congress would be required before construction of the Juniper unit could be undertaken.

[6], [7], [8], and [9]. Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 are all for the purpose of carrying out an agreement recently reached among the upper Colorado River Basin States. This agreement was that power revenues available from the storage project power operations to assist irrigation development in the upper basin should be credited to the upper basin states on the basis of the percentages of upper basin water remaining to be developed in each such State.

At the time hearings were held last year some interests in the upper basin made known their criticism of the bill on the basis that there were certain inequities in it relating to financial assistance to future irrigation development in the upper basin. It was the contention that, in order that each State might know what its possibility of future development might be, the power revenues available for financial assistance to irrigation should be credited to the States by a formula which took into account each State's share of the upper basin's water. After House consideration of the bill was postponed last year, there was a determined drive by representatives of the upper basin States,

acting through the Upper Colorado River Commission, an entity approved by the Federal Government and having Federal representation, to bring the legislation in line with the unanimous wishes of all the upper basin States. Several meetings were held. These were culminated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on January 5 at which meeting the upper basin States, through the commission, reached agreement with respect to crediting each of the upper basin States with certain percentages of storage project power revenues available to assist irrigation—the percentages to be based upon the amount of water remaining to be developed in each State. This agreement, known as the Santa Fe accord, is carried out by these amendments.

The revenues credited, within the basin fund, to each State, to be used for assistance to irrigation development in each such State, cannot be spent without specific appropriation by the Congress. The financial operations within the basin fund as a result of these amendments fall within and are consistent with the repayment plan proposed in H. R. 3383, as previously reported. The Bureau of Reclamation has prepared detailed financial studies based upon the project repayment plan in the bill including the provisions of these amendments and has assured the committee that the repayment requirements can be met. A letter from the Commissioner of Reclamation relating to this matter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1956.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASPINALL: During an informal conference in your office on February 1, 1956, representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation were asked to review the repayment analysis of the Central Utah project (initial phase development) in view of certain amendments now under consideration concerning procedures set out in H. R. 3383, a bill for authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

We are pleased to comply with your request and submit the results of our review based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest ($2\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest ($2\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period.

These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5 percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of—

- (a) Operation, maintenance and replacement costs;
- (b) Interest on power investments;
- (c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation;
- (d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Under the terms of the proposed amendments of H. R. 3383 a basin fund could be established providing the Utah projects the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent. In doing so, total credits in the basin fund would be governed by the requirements of Utah's participating projects because of their magnitude. Credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383. In fact only one-third of these credits will be required to complete the repayment of all the projects proposed in H. R. 3383, namely, central Utah and Emery County projects in Utah, Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, and Florida projects in Colorado, the Pine River extension project in Colorado and New Mexico, the Hammond project in New Mexico, the Seedskadee, LaBarge and Lyman projects in Wyoming, and the presently authorized Eden project in Wyoming.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

[10]. Amendment No. 10 provides that the capital cost of any participating project allocated to the irrigation of Indian-owned lands which is beyond the capability of these lands to repay will be nonreimbursable. There are 1,940 acres of Indian-owned lands in the projects authorized by this legislation—the Florida project and the Pine River extension project having some Indian lands. The cost allocated to these Indian lands is about \$388,000, of which about \$250,000 would be nonreimbursable under this amendment.

[11]. Amendment No. 11 strikes section 13 from the bill previously reported. This section is made unnecessary by recent agreement between representatives of the eastern slope and western slope of Colorado, with respect to the diversion of western slope water for municipal use by Denver and others, and by the filing on October 12 of a final decree by the United States district court in the matter of adjudication of priorities of water rights relating to operation of the Federal Colorado-Big Thompson project.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends enactment of H. R. 3383, as amended herein.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 3383, AS AMENDED

In a rather unusual step, a majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considered and approved amendments to H. R. 3383 on February 8, 1956, some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none.

A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before your committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House. It should not be permitted.

The "new" H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil-bank proposal is now before the Congress. It will require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses. H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops (some of which may well be placed in soil-bank reserve) to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

I. THE BULK OF THE PROJECT REMAINS THE SAME

Save for the extraordinary provision apportioning power revenues among the four States in which the projects will be built, the bill remains substantially the same. The only change in projects enumerated has been in section 2. Here Woody Creek has been eliminated and San Miguel and Yellow Jacket substituted, all in Colorado.

Since we are dealing with the same hulk, all of the objections already voiced on this bill hold good. These objections with some reference to recent material are here set forth in brief review by your minority for your convenience. (See pp. 25-29, H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., for greater detail.)

(a) *The \$1¼ billion project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing.*—Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only a part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

(b) *The project will damage the Nation's agricultural economy.*—The report of the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the crops to be grown on these projects will be largely grain and forage crops for

dairy cows and sheep which will produce butter, milk products, and wool which are already in surplus and under Government subsidy and in storage at a fantastic cost.

The projects will service for the most part only marginal agricultural land much of it at high altitudes suffering frosts each month of the year and having a short growing season at best. Contrast this with the fact that there are at least 20 million acres of first-class land on existing farms in 19 States of the Middle West, South Atlantic, and Southern States that can be placed in production at any time they may be needed at a fraction of the cost. And contrast it with the further fact that Congress is now considering the soil-bank proposal which will take 40 million acres out of production.

(c) *The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least \$5 billion* (probably a low figure because based on the Bureau of Reclamation cost estimates which have proved notoriously short of actual construction costs).

Even if the original construction cost were to be repaid as claimed in a repayment period of 100 years, the cost to the Federal Government in the form of a hidden subsidy in interest charges on the funds borrowed and advanced for construction of the projects named in the bill would amount to at least \$4 billion. This would be some \$5,000 per acre on the total area to be serviced. In comparison the irrigated lands when fully developed would have an average sale value of about \$150 an acre.

(d) *Ninety-eight percent of the project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located.*—This hidden subsidy for the four States benefited is unconscionable. It cannot and would never be repaid from project revenues and would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers. The percent of the Federal tax burden by States as computed by the Tax Foundation shows that less than 2 percent of this required Federal subsidy would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the chief beneficiaries of the projects. The State of New York would pay over 12 percent, Ohio about 6 percent, Illinois and Pennsylvania about 7 percent each, etc. It will be a burden on all of the taxpayers for generations to come.

(e) *The appropriation authorization of \$760 million is misleading.*—The cost of the projects authorized by section 1 of the bill alone would amount to \$933,468,300 based on Bureau of Reclamation estimates. The construction costs of all the projects covered in the bill amount to about \$1.6 billion. The figure of \$760 million in the pending bill hides from Congress the true cost of the development.

(f) *The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound.*—None of the irrigation reclamation projects are financially sound. The irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay only about 12 percent of the irrigation investment, which, including storage costs, would range from \$750 to \$900 per acre varying with the number of projects included. The power dams are supposed to provide the revenues to pay for themselves as well as 88 percent of the irrigation investment.

The project repayment provisions contemplate an overall repayment period of at least 100 years. This is unrealistic and economically indefensible. The hearings make it clear that the repayment plan might work for only a minimum number of projects and that with

additional projects there would be no possibility of payment within 100 years unless the power rate were increased substantially above the 6-mill rate contemplated in the Bureau's report. Furthermore, it is extremely doubtful that a market for the power even at the 6-mill rate would continue for 100 years. The approaching availability of atomic electric power will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete. In fact, the market area is not now in need of the power which would be provided. The power dams are in the bill because they are the only hope of making the overall project appear feasible.

The project is not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Studies show that simple interest alone on the investment would be greater than the estimated net revenues.

(g) *Central Utah (initial phase), the project's largest irrigation segment, is the most infeasible of all.*—The estimated cost of this project for the irrigation features alone is \$127 million to irrigate 160,000 acres at a cost of \$794 per acre, exclusive of hidden interest subsidy by the taxpayers. The Bureau studies show that the water users could repay only \$94 per acre or 12 percent of the construction cost over a period of 70 years.

(h) *The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.*—The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects which are both economically and financially infeasible (1) by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits, while (2) at the same time, overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Large indirect benefits are included in order to secure a favorable benefit-cost ratio. Moreover, the benefits are evaluated over a period of 100 years, which is extremely speculative. The procedure in both of these respects is contrary to the report to the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy which recommends that projects be evaluated on the basis of direct benefits only and over a period of not to exceed 50 years.

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability. This has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

(i) *Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project.*

Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill:

(a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years;

(b) the municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit;

(c) the irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years "in addition to any development period authorized by law."

Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Present law requires interest at "not less than" 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum.

(j) *The bill does not represent the bill approved by the administration.*—The bill's projects are different—the administration recommended authorization of 2 storage units, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating reclamation projects, at an estimated construction cost of \$930 million.

The House bill authorizes 4 storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti and Navaho—and 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also, in section 2, provides what is tantamount to an advance commitment of the Congress to authorize 23 additional reclamation projects.

The Bureau of the Budget definitely recommended against authorization at this time of Flaming Gorge, Curecanti and Navaho. In addition, the administration recommended that the legislation provide that authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditioned on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements, with reports submitted to the Congress on each project; and that new studies of direct agricultural benefits be made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

The bill contains no provision whatever for the reevaluation so specified by the administration and hence ignores this important requirement set forth as a condition precedent to administration approval.

Financial repayment features are basically contrary to those approved and recommended by the administration. The administration set up as a requirement that all reimbursable costs of the project should be repaid in 50 years, together with interest on the unamortized balance of the investments in power and municipal water supply features.

The bill departs materially from the specified repayment criteria. It would attempt to adhere to repayment of the irrigation investment in 50 years, but would do so by the device of extending the repayment period for the power investment to not exceed 100 years, or twice the 50-year repayment period specified by the administration.

(k) *The project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering, and financial surveys prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete.*—The official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of Bureau witnesses clearly show that the investigations, surveys, and studies in regard to engineering and the economic and financial aspects of the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects are incomplete and inadequate. This point will be expanded upon later in these minority views, with particular reference to Glen Canyon, the major feature of the present proposal.

(l) *The project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential.*—The area is unbelievably rich in minerals. Its coal, oil shale, and uranium, to name but a few, contain the prospects of a mighty hinterland. These resources and the industry they would nourish will require water for development. The area has but a limited supply, yet this bill would squander the water in hopeless dedica-

tion to uneconomic irrigation. The value of crops under western irrigation is about 10 cents per 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn; that of manufactured products is about \$5 per 1,000 gallons. If the expenditures necessary under this bill were to be those of the area affected, then that area could select its destiny. But 98 percent of the true cost is to be borne by the rest of the Nation. In such a situation Congress should reject the alleged preference for a surplus-ridden farm economy.

II. RECENT MATERIAL AFFECTING THIS PROJECT AND THE NEW COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS REQUIRE DETAILED EXAMINATION

1. *The provision for apportioning revenues to each of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming is unprecedented and unsound*

The revised bill, H. R. 3383, contains in section 5 (c) an unprecedented proposal of apportioning by arbitrary percentages all of the net revenues from power to the four States of the upper Colorado River Basin. These apportioned revenues are to be reserved for use to subsidize uneconomic irrigation projects solely in those States. This means, on the one hand, that the Federal Government and the taxpayers would be holding the bag in the probable event that the revenues available to certain of these States under the proposed inflexible proposal would prove insufficient to repay the irrigation costs as required, while, on the other hand, certain other States might have revenues available in excess of repayment requirements of initially authorized irrigation projects and would demand authorization of additional irrigation projects on the basis of availability of such funds, regardless of economic justification or need.

There has been no report by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget on this unprecedented proposal which on its face is unsound and bad business for the Federal Government. It represents a total departure from existing law, which, under the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment of 1938 (43 U. S. C. A., sec. 392a), requires that net revenues from power, after the power allocation has been repaid, be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

2. *The effort to delete Echo Park is misleading*

By the addition of a sentence to section 3 the committee majority indicates that the controversial Echo Park Dam problem has been disposed of. Echo Park is of course still in the Senate bill.

Your minority recognizes, as does the majority, that this Congress cannot bind a future Congress. The sentence added to section 3 may be all that the committee can do, legislatively. But it is not all that the committee can do under its powers of inquiry.

Your committee was told by Interior Department Under Secretary Tudor that taking out Echo Park would be like taking the pistons out of an engine. He said:

* * * the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted (p. 24, hearings on H. R. 4449, 83d Cong., 2d sess., January 1954).

Fourteen months later, Reclamation Bureau Commissioner Dexter was asked:

Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes. Although by elimination of parts of the project the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin (p. 174, hearings on H. R. 3383, 83d Cong., 2d sess., March 1955).

And later (at p. 193) Mr. Dexheimer said:

It (Echo Park) is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan.

This is uncontroverted testimony from the experts. There is much more that could be quoted to the same effect, both by Interior witnesses and upper basin engineers or representatives (see pp. 32, 38, 51, 174, 193-194, 471, 551-552, 559, 571, 615, 619, 623, 683-684, 703, 706 of the hearings on H. R. 3383, 84th Cong., 1st sess., March 1955). Echo Park is being withdrawn from this bill, yet all of the other projects are staying in. How, in the face of the testimony, can this be done and a feasible project still be claimed? It is the duty of your committee to resolve this matter. It could do so by requiring a further study and report, for the record, from the Bureau of Reclamation, and by hearing these same witnesses on the bill without Echo Park.

Without such action only one conclusion can be drawn and that is that Echo Park will be required for inclusion at some time in order to put the pistons in the engine in the effort to rescue vast expenditures on an infeasible project. As it now stands, your majority is sending to the House a bill which the Commissioner of Reclamation has conceded is economically infeasible.

3. *There are physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit which cast doubt on its engineering and financial feasibility*

Your majority has amended section 1 so as to require the Secretary to take adequate measures, as a part of the Glen Canyon unit, to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. This calls up a series of questionable aspects with respect to Glen Canyon.

(a) *There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam.*—In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified at that time before your Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built. At 700 feet Glen Canyon would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. This formation is nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune. It was created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of another.

(b) *There is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam upon which the Bureau's cost estimates are based.*—These plans on which costs have been estimated are set forth in House Document

364, 83d Congress, which is the Bureau's basic planning report on the upper Colorado River project. These plans reveal that the cross section of the dam, which would be about the same height as Hoover Dam, is materially slimmer than Hoover Dam—this in the face of the fact that the foundation rock at Glen Canyon, as testified to by Bureau engineers and geologists, is only about one-fifth as strong as the rock at Hoover. It appears, therefore, that if a safe dam can be built at Glen Canyon, it will require a much more massive structure than the plans set forth in House Document 364, and that the construction cost will be substantially greater than estimated.

(c) *The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.*—Although the new H. R. 3383 now provides in section 1 that the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, so far there are no plans, and hence no assurance that protective measures can be provided which will be adequate, nor is there evidence that the cost of protection has been included in the cost estimates. As presently planned, the reservoir would back up close to the foundations of the Rainbow Natural Bridge, which is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. The Bureau has indicated that a dam would be built in the canyon below the bridge to keep out the reservoir water, but it appears that water would seep through the dam and also collect from natural drainage and back up under the Rainbow arch, thus jeopardizing this marvelous monument. The opinion of an independent consulting geologist given to one member of your minority is that "regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subject to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir" through the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone.

(d) *Large quantities of water may be absorbed into the formations surrounding the Glen Canyon Reservoir.*—Geologic reports show that the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains basins, both adjacent to the reservoir site, contain tremendous formations of pervious sandstone which have a combined capacity of 350 million acre-feet. The reports indicate that these formations at the present time are practically empty of water. Thus, as the reservoir fills, these formations could absorb tremendous quantities of water making it impossible to accomplish the storage and regulation of water and the production of power contemplated by the project. Since these basins have a capacity some 14 times greater than the proposed reservoir, it would appear absolutely essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and thus free to drain water from the reservoir.

(e) *The Chinle shale problem must be satisfactorily investigated and explained.*—One member of your minority visited the Glen Canyon Reservoir site in company with a consulting geologist in December 1955. The trip showed that there exists along some 50 miles of the canyon sides of the reservoir a formation designated as Chinle shale, which is overlain by massive formations of sandstone. The Chinle is not thin. Neglected United States Geological Survey reports show that it has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, and its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the Colorado River appears similar. Its importance to the reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these

overlying cliff-forming rocks. This Chinle formation, when subjected to water, immediately disintegrates into mud. As a result, the entire overburden mass of sandstone could crumble and be precipitated into the reservoir basin with untold adverse effect on the functioning of the reservoir.

The foregoing engineering problems are not of first impression. Surveys of the area, now three decades old, indicated the Glen Canyon site to be an impressive one but possessed of formation difficulties needing the most exhaustive tests. If \$421,270,000 (the Bureau estimate) is to be spent here, the record on Glen Canyon must be unassailable. Congress should demand a thorough evaluation by an independent board of engineers before authorizing this key structure.

4. The bill is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955

If ever a piece of water resources legislation cried for processing under the procedures the Presidential Advisory Committee recommends, this is it. This would involve an application of benefit-cost principles which would give a more realistic appraisal of the benefits and detriments of this project; and ultimate review by an independent board of review which should give the Congress a correct picture of the highly controverted engineering and financial details of the proposal.

Compare just two of the statements of the Presidential Advisory Committee with the facts of this project:

(1) *Use of excess revenues.*—

* * * * * *

The Committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived. However, it should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenue to aid projects which are in no way related to the facility producing the excess revenues amounts in reality to the operation of a Government facility to obtain a profit to be used for other purposes, and there are obvious limits beyond which such a policy cannot be justified (report, pp. 33-34),

The participating projects to be benefited by the anticipated power revenues are connected in no other way with the power dams. Each one of these irrigation ventures could be constructed without the storage dams. No water impounded by these dams is to be placed on the land. Yet, 88 percent of the cost of these irrigation projects is expected to be repaid from power revenues. If such a percentage does not exceed obvious limits, what would? The precedent in this bill would be so enormous for this type of subsidy that we may as well forget a national water policy on this score.

(2) *Payment of interest.*—

* * * * * *

The Committee recommends that as a general policy interest be paid on all Federal investment subject to repayment. In making this recommendation, the Committee recognizes that the provision of interest-free Federal funds for irrigation does not conform to this policy. The Committee believes, however, that this provision should not be eliminated but rather that interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost, as should all nonreimbursable items in all projects (report, p. 34).

The Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that the project recommended by the Secretary (Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams and 11

participating projects) would result in a total interest cost of \$1,153 million in the year 2032.

This staggering figure has been variously estimated by other sources to run as high as \$4 billion, depending on which of the many overall project plans may be under consideration. In any event, consider the Bureau figure as a minimum. This is not included as a project cost as the Presidential Advisory Committee now recommends. It was brought out only by determined questioning. It gives some idea of the true cost of the project to the taxpayers.

5. The project would seriously impair water rights in the lower basin of the Colorado River

H. R. 3383 is planned on interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are the exact opposite of those involved in the planning and operation of Hoover Dam. These interpretations are at issue in *Arizona v. California*, now before the Supreme Court. Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and the United States are parties to this litigation and will be bound by the result. The Court recently denied a motion to join the upper basin States as such, at this stage of the proceedings, by a 5 to 3 vote, without opinion. The important thing, however, is that the United States will be bound by the final decision and will be required to operate its projects, whether in the upper States or the lower, in accordance with that decision. That decision will determine which set of assumptions, those on which lower-basin projects have been built and are operating or those on which the upper-basin project is planned, is correct. Both cannot be.

Evidence of the impact of the upper-basin project upon the southern California area is found in a report submitted to the San Diego County Water Authority in September 1955 by a board of engineers composed of Raymond Hill, John Longwell, and Carl Rankin (Mr. Hill was retained by Colorado in 1953 to report to that State on the water resources of the Colorado River available to it (see S. Doc. 23, 84th Cong., 1st sess.)). Conclusions in the report to the San Diego County Water Authority pertinent here are (see report, p. 20):

16. When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the Metropolitan Water District, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

17. In order to obtain its full right in the Colorado of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum, it will be necessary for the Metropolitan Water District to make other arrangements to replace the deficiency resulting from the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project.

18. Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous * * *.

Thus these California agencies which have had firm contracts with the United States since the early 1930's for the delivery of fixed amounts of water and which have constructed works costing hundreds of millions of dollars to carry this water to the coastal plain, face a loss of half of their water right through this project. As the report notes, the effect would be disastrous.

While this litigation is pending and while the water rights remain in doubt Congress should not authorize H. R. 3383.

6. *This bill would not assist the Navaho Indians*

It provides for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, but not for the present construction of the Navaho project. However, the construction of the dam would have the effect of committing Congress to constructing the irrigation project works. The cost of the dam is estimated at \$36,500,000; the irrigation project an additional \$175 million. There are some 1,100 Navaho families involved meaning a construction cost of close to \$200,000 for each Navaho farm. This is just to bring water to the land and does not account for assistance which will undoubtedly be necessary for equipment to get the lands in production. This astounding cost should be most carefully considered before Congress acts, particularly since H. R. 3383 as recently amended now provides that costs allocated to Indian lands which such lands cannot repay shall be nonreimbursable (sec. 6). This amendment was advertised as a "gift" to the Indians by newspapers reporting on recent upper-basin conferences which led to the amending of H. R. 3383. It is a gift Congress might well inspect closely. Certainly some more realistic and more economic method of providing for the Indians can be considered. By this gift, the upper basin shows its unwillingness to have the costs of Navaho project paid for by the power revenues, as all the other costs are supposed to be. Instead, this money will go into the funds to be apportioned among these States, leaving the taxpayers in the rest of the country to carry the load.

III. THE BILL SHOULD BE RECOMMITTED

At the least the bill should be recommitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for further study and hearings upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget.

The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects thereof have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. On the contrary, the reports received from those agencies recommended authorization of only 2 storage units, Glen and Echo (1 of which—Echo—has been excluded from the pending bill H. R. 3383, although it is included for authorization in the bill S. 500 passed by the Senate), and 11 reclamation projects. However, with respect to the 11 reclamation projects, the draft of legislation recommended by the Secretary of the Interior specified that their economic justification should be reexamined before construction should proceed. This request is ignored and omitted from H. R. 3383. The bill proposes authorization of 3 storage units, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, and Curecanti, which were not approved for authorization by the Secretary and the Budget Bureau.

Moreover, the Secretary and the Budget Bureau have never reported upon or approved the proposed repayment provisions of H. R. 3383, particularly the 100-year repayment period proposed for power features of the project. On the contrary, a 50-year repayment of the power investments was specified by these agencies, with interest on the unamortized investment.

In the recent report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy transmitted to the Congress by the President, it was concluded and recommended that the economic life of reclama-

tion projects should not be considered to exceed 50 years for evaluation purposes. Of course, the proposal in the pending bill of 100 years' repayment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic, and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. Even in the case of the major storage unit proposed for authorization, Glen Canyon, which is estimated to produce some 85 percent of the prospective power revenues, the evidence available indicates that there are serious questions with respect to the geologic formations of the reservoir affecting the functioning of this unit which demand further investigation before authorization. Moreover, the plans for the dam itself and its probable cost have not been adequately determined, lending uncertainty to the financial soundness of this unit which is set up to be the cash register of the upper basin development.

All these unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in H. R. 3383 should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project, with its intricate web of engineering and financial arrangements, cries out for such a review.

JOHN P. SAYLOR.
CRAIG HOSMER.
JAMES B. UTT.
JOHN R. PILLION.
GEO. A. SHUFORD.
JAMES A. HALEY.



navigation would cost far more than the traffic would justify.

In answer to them, we can point out that both the Army and the Congress have officially decreed that the Arkansas is navigable—and that the benefits more than justify the cost. Economic justification is one of the requisites for approval by both the Army engineers and the Congress, and it should be noted that the Army engineers in all their history of working with the inland waterways have never overestimated the benefit to cost ratio in determining the feasibility of a navigation project. In every instance where improvements have been made on their recommendation, the actual tonnages carried have exceeded their conservative estimates.

On the Ohio River, for example, the Army engineers' original estimate in 1908 was 9 million tons annually. In 1954 the actual traffic on the river amounted to 55 million tons. On the Illinois River, the estimate in 1933 was 8,330,000 tons. Traffic in 1954 on this link totaled 15,354,000 tons. For the upper Mississippi project, the estimate in 1930 was 9 million tons annually. In 1954 this section of the river carried 16,295,000 tons.

No one who is familiar with the spectacular development of inland waterway transportation can doubt that the estimates for the Arkansas are even more conservative. There are many commodities and raw materials which would contribute to impressive tonnages on the Arkansas if the river were improved for navigation. Millions of tons of steel are used each year by the oil industry. More steel is used in the construction industry and by fabricators. Savings running into millions of dollars annually could be made if this steel could move from the steel centers of the Middle West into these States by water. In Oklahoma alone it is estimated that about a half million tons of the materials used to make fertilizers are shipped in annually. Water transportation would lower the cost of these fertilizers to the farmers.

One of the principal cash crops of this area is cotton. Cotton, as you know, requires a great deal of commercial fertilizer. Farmers of this area can make substantial savings not only on fertilizers manufactured in this area but also on commercial fertilizers shipped into this area. Let me cite a specific example: The rail rate on fertilizer from Sheffield, Ala., to Fort Smith, with 60,000 pounds minimum, is \$9.40 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent; on a 30,000-pound minimum shipment the rate is \$10 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent. The barge rate from Sheffield, Ala., to Helena, Ark., on fertilizer, with a 500-ton minimum, is \$2.76 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent; on a 400-ton minimum the rate is \$3.20 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent. This is one side of the story. Let's look at the other side—the rail rate on cotton from Fort Smith, Ark., to New Orleans, with a minimum shipment of 25,000 pounds is \$16.80 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent; on a 65,000-pound minimum the rail rate is \$13 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent. The barge rate on cotton from Memphis to New Orleans, with a 300-ton minimum shipment, is \$2.84 per ton plus 15 percent plus 3 percent. You can see from these figures that the farmer will benefit immensely when water transportation is available in this area, not only in the low-cost barge rates but also in the influence these rates will have on rail rates.

This area ships vast quantities of petroleum and petroleum products which can move by water. Bauxite is an important raw material from this area which can move by water. Wheat and rice are agricultural commodities which can find ready markets at home and abroad if water transportation is available. Eastern Oklahoma has reserves of high-grade coal estimated at 5 billion

tons. Today that coal is virtually priced out of the market because of high freight rates.

The improvement of the Arkansas River for navigation was authorized by Congress in 1938. Since then there have been other authorizations for some of the flood-control reservoirs which will contribute to navigation. I submit to you it is time something happened to bring this authorization to a reality. I can promise you the wholehearted support of the Mississippi Valley Association, which I represent.

Our platform for 1955, unanimously adopted at our last annual meeting, recommended that "Congress appropriate sufficient funds to expedite the authorized project for the Arkansas Basin for flood control, bank stabilization, navigation and incidental hydroelectric power." In addition, we made specific recommendations for key dams in both States, for the Ouachita Basin, the St. Francis Basin, the Cache Basin and the White River Basin. We stand ready to work with you in these projects.

We cannot afford to think in small terms or make little plans for the future. I am convinced it is time we take a long hard look at our program of permanent public works, not only in the Arkansas Basin, but everywhere in this country. By 1975 it is now estimated we will have in the United States a population of 200 million people. This is a gain of 40 million and is the equivalent of the total population of the six New England States, plus New York, Pennsylvania and Maryland.

It is estimated it will take 121 million hogs, 10,500,000 cattle, 30 billion pounds of fluid milk, and nearly 15 billion dozen eggs just to feed the newcomers in the next 20 years, to say nothing of the clothing, houses, automobiles and other things they will require. We need to lift our sights on the public improvements the newcomers will need, too. We shall need more transportation, larger water reserves, more roads and many other things. I said at the outset that opportunity in Arkansas and Oklahoma beckons with open arms. Perhaps it is more accurate to suggest that opportunity is pleading with us in our deliberations today to act now to bring about the development authorized by Congress, to build up the industry and agriculture of these States and to come into the heritage that is rightfully yours to possess and to use to build a better life and a more stable economy.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Winters and Mr. Byrns have outlined far more ably than I could the situation on the Arkansas River, and its great merit. As far as I am personally concerned, I join with my colleagues and all of the others in their effort to effect the construction of this great project which when completed will add so much to the lifeblood of commerce in the great Southwest, of which we are all proud. It is a proud section of this great land of ours. We are for the whole country, and we think the development of the East, the North, the South, the West, or any section helps us. We also feel that the development of the Southwest, particularly the Arkansas basin, will be a good thing for the country as a whole.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate also his inserting the fine speech made by Mr. Winters of the Mississippi Valley Association. It is a fine address, and we are deeply appreciative of the support of that splendid association.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma for his diligence in this matter. I trust that the Administration will have this program well under way by 1957, the 50th anniversary of our great State. It will not only promote commerce and industry but it will also save a great amount of property and quite a number of lives, and it will also help us to reduce the high freight rates we have to pay in Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my colleague for his most timely remarks. I too hope we can celebrate our 50th anniversary with full steam ahead on the Arkansas River Basin project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD at this point an exchange of correspondence between myself and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and also a statement from our colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.
Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I respectfully call your attention to special orders granted in my name on next Monday and Tuesday, February 13 and 14—at which time several of us in the Oklahoma and Arkansas delegations will be discussing a matter of great urgency to our States: continuation of the Arkansas Basin development program.

We do not wish to improve unnecessarily upon the time of the House, but believe all Members will wish to be informed on a matter involving a question of grave importance to this Congress: whether the Executive, after signing into law an appropriation bill providing for starts on construction of two important dams in adjoining States, can thereafter block legislative will and direction by delaying construction and using the Budget Bureau to head off further appropriations?

The Eufaula and Dardanelle Dams, and the Arkansas Basin program—which Congress voted to get under way last session—are now being held up under these conditions.

We do not believe Congress will accept this situation, and we will be seeking your understanding and help next Monday and Tuesday. Many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

ED EDMONDSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.
Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Have your letter of February 8 and am in heartiest accord.

You may be certain I shall cooperate at every opportunity.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Your friend,

CLARENCE CANNON.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN JARMAN

Mr. Speaker, I join with my Oklahoma colleagues and with our fellow colleagues from Arkansas in urging the prompt continuation

and completion of the Arkansas Basin development program.

I believe that Congress has made clear its intent to push this program to completion and that this intent should not be circumvented by executive action through the Bureau of the Budget.

This project should not be postponed any longer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been extremely gratified in the support of the Arkansas Basin program and the expression of willingness to help us from the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I want to take this time to thank both the Oklahoma delegation and the Arkansas delegation for the splendid help they have given us in our flood control irrigation problems in New Mexico in the past. We appreciate the splendid cooperation we have received from both these delegations.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I shall do everything I can for the gentleman's project, for I believe in the development of the resources of our country.

I see before me over the Speaker's dais a quotation from the words of Daniel Webster. If the gentleman will allow me, I shall read it:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

I thank the gentleman, again, and his colleagues for their cooperation in such projects, which we are always happy to reciprocate.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my very good friend from New Mexico.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman, and again I want to commend my colleague. I am pleased that the gentleman has mentioned the Eufaula Reservoir as one of the great projects in the Arkansas system for which \$450,000 was appropriated last year. Is that not correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is.

Mr. ALBERT. I will ask the gentleman first of all if the Eufaula Reservoir would not impound waters on the largest tributary of the Arkansas.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It would impound waters both on the North Canadian and the South Canadian.

Mr. ALBERT. I will ask him also if this has not been considered by the Corps of Engineers as one of the key structures in the development of the Arkansas.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It has been from the very inception of the plan for the Arkansas Basin project.

Mr. ALBERT. I ask my colleague whether the overall program, particularly the navigation program, of the Arkansas depends largely upon the previous construction of the Eufaula Reser-

voir due to its great silt-retaining capacity. Is that not true?

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding that navigation will not be feasible until the Eufaula Dam has been constructed, and there is no point in talking about navigation until it is constructed.

Mr. ALBERT. I now ask my friend if it is not also true that notwithstanding the present policy of the administration regarding the construction of hydroelectric power dams, the Eufaula Dam is nevertheless one of the rare projects where the production of hydroelectric power can be justified under that policy. Is that not true?

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding that the justification for the Eufaula Dam can be sustained even under revised circular A-47 because of its power potential and because of its great flood protection potential and other benefits.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

BUILDING COSTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I speak today of a matter which is causing grave concern among home builders throughout this great Nation.

It is estimated that there are now 46,800,000 dwelling units in existence. Fifty-six percent of these are owned outright by the occupants. The average or typical home price for new construction, nationwide, at this time, is ten to fifteen thousand dollars. Residential construction from 1950 to the present time amounted to a gross sum of \$79 million. The Commerce Department estimate for 1956 is for \$44 billion for home construction and 1,200,000 units including 92,000 prefabricated homes would be built. In 1955, 1,300,000 were built.

Truly, America is a great Nation; prosperous, growing, and freedom loving. We have managed to provide housing for a great proportion of our citizens regardless of income. Nothing like this has ever been accomplished elsewhere. Nothing behind the Iron Curtain approaches it.

You are familiar, I am sure, with the many problems facing America's homeowners and home builders today. Building costs are at an all-time high. There are taxes, gas, light, and water bills, and other incidental expenses which must be paid. But one problem that is among those of grave concern to the majority of home builders and of homeowners is the home mortgage.

Home mortgages are held by savings and loan associations, life insurance companies, and commercial banks.

Banking and lending institutions, most of them on Wall Street, control this Nation's mortgage debt to the extent of \$82.8 billion.

But here is the basic problem of immediate concern: If a home builder or homeowner wishes to mortgage his home, he finds it very difficult and frequently impossible to get a banking or lending

institution to accept his mortgage unless he is willing to pay a premium, or in other words, accept a discount. The banks now discount as much as 5 percent before they purchase the mortgage. This means that for every \$10,000 mortgage bought, \$500 is immediately collected by the lending institution. This discount is in addition to the normal handling or service charges plus interest during the life of the mortgage.

The annual take on this apparently is well in excess of half a billion dollars—out of the pockets of America's home builders. It is difficult to understand how this situation could have been permitted to arise—more difficult to understand how it is permitted to continue. The lending institutions have nothing to lose in that mortgages are guaranteed as safe papers by the Federal Government. There is no element of risk for them.

It is a condition which should be corrected immediately. The Federal Government should provide, if necessary, a ready market for home mortgages. In fairness to business, this Federal mortgage market should be available only when the mortgages cannot be sold on the private market without excessive discounts. Five percent or any amount approaching it is an excessive discount.

In order for this matter to be successfully resolved, the Congress should enact new basic legislation or re-enact legislative provisions, previously in force, to assure the homeowner this saving. The proper agency of Government should be empowered immediately by Congress to purchase these mortgages from the homeowner at any time and in any amount justified by national conditions for the protection of American families and their homes.

UPPER COLORADO STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, we hope, the upper Colorado storage project bill will be before us for consideration. The able members of the Committee on the Interior who have worked on this bill now for 2 years, will show the membership of the House, if given the opportunity, the vast importance of this project, and that it is feasible, that it is sound, and that it is necessary.

But before they can do that, the rule making consideration of the bill in order must be passed. My purpose today is only to plead, on behalf of my State, and on behalf of the other States affected—yes, and on behalf of all the States—to give us the opportunity to debate the bill on its merits, to consider it, and to vote on it.

I urge the membership to vote for the rule so that these States, so deeply interested in the harnessing, storage, and utilization of the upper Colorado River waters, may not be foreclosed from presenting the facts, and so that Members

be not foreclosed from hearing the facts on the merits of the bill.

As one indication of the importance of this bill, let me respectfully remind the House that a great and solemn pact between the upper and lower States of the Colorado Basin was entered into in Santa Fe 34 years ago, dividing the waters of the river for purposes of orderly development and utilization. That pact between those States, and affecting also our neighbor republic of Mexico, was made under the authority of Congress and approved by it.

That great and solemn pact is and will be a nullity, and its great purpose will be frustrated, so far as the upper Colorado River States are concerned, unless orderly development of the upper Colorado River is undertaken.

That solemn compact allocated 7½ million acre-feet of water per year to the lower basin, 7½ million acre-feet of water to the upper basin, and 1½ million acre-feet of water to the republic of Mexico. Mexico is getting, instead, and will continue to get unless the compact is carried out, as much as 4 million acre-feet per year. The compact is useless to us in the upper States unless we can have storage reservoirs to impound our share of the waters, and to put them to use.

The lower basin, with the construction of Hoover Dam, and other reservoirs, huge tunnels and canals, and vast hydro-electric works, has been fully developed at a cost of many hundreds of millions of dollars. Hundreds of thousands of people from New Mexico, Oklahoma, and other States have poured into California to operate irrigation farms or to work on irrigation farms, and in the vast industrial plants which were made possible by that development. We do not begrudge California any of it, but rejoice with it in its phenomenal growth.

All we ask is that we be given the same opportunity and the same assistance from the Federal Government, which alone can make such development possible. It is true that it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, a sum that seems vast when you look at the entire upper-basin proposal; but the only sensible way to direct its development is by an orderly planning for the entire basin now.

These amounts of money will be expended, not now but through many decades in the future, on plans which we are asking Congress to make now in the interests of efficient and orderly development. We are asking the Congress to plan not for ourselves of this generation, but for all posterity and for many generations to come. None of us will live to see all of these projects completed and put into operation. These plans are for the future of our country, and those future generations will bless the courage and the vision of this Congress, or whatever Congress does authorize such plans.

As these waters and the power development are put to beneficial use, and even as the work progresses, millions and eventually billions of dollars will be returned in taxes to the Treasury in the years to come, over and above direct repayments on the sums advanced.

Indeed, if one but stops to think, the amount to be expended in this project during the contemplated 30 to 50 years of its development is not so large, compared to like expenditures made in the 30-year period of development in the lower basin, at a time when dollars were harder to get and of higher value in purchasing power.

We are grieved, of course, that people in the lower basin who profited by 30 years' development under the compact through the aid of Congress now seek to prevent the carrying out of the compact insofar as the upper States are concerned. The compact would be useless, meaningless, a travesty on the good faith of our people and of our States, if they succeed. If they succeed, a grave and irreparable injustice will be done.

Great public utilities able to serve the many great defense plants and other industrial establishments in southern California have flourished there. These great corporations have done and are doing a splendid work.

I am proud to say that in 1928 the Honorable John Morrow, in this House, as Representative from New Mexico; the Honorable Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado; Senator Sam Bratton, of New Mexico; Senators Phipps and Waterman, of Colorado; Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming; and Senator William King, of Utah; and other Representatives and Senators from the upper States, stood with California in the battle for the construction of Hoover Dam against great opposition and helped make possible the development of southern California.

Can we be blamed if we grieve now, when those great utility and industrial corporations which we helped make possible, should now use their great strength to nullify the benefits of the Santa Fe compact as it applies to us?

It is said that a corporation is defined as an artificial person created by law, with power to sue and be sued, to contract and be contracted with, and to carry on the business for which it was created. The law can and does invest a corporation with almost all of the attributes of a natural person in the business world, but there is one thing that the law cannot do: it cannot invest a corporation with a heart or a conscience.

Understandably a corporation acts with one goal in mind and one goal only, to provide and to preserve profits and advantages for its stockholders. It is concerned with that and that only. In that endeavor such corporations feel justified in expending vast sums of money to ward off any possible danger real or imaginary which might in the distant future stand in the way of their expansion, and in the way of expanded profits and advantages for their stockholders.

But the Members of this House, this Congress, and the Nation do have a heart and do have a conscience. They know what is going on. There is no money—no matter how lush the funds may be, no matter how strong the adverse propaganda provided by those funds may be—that will prevail against right and justice before this House, the Congress, and the Nation. We have faith that right and justice will prevail.

(Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ALASKA'S CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 5, 1956, delegates to the Alaska Constitutional Convention, in session at the University of Alaska for the preceding 75 days, affixed their signatures to a constitution for the future State of Alaska. This constitution, including two ordinances, will be presented to the voters of Alaska for ratification or rejection April 24.

Since under terms of pending statehood legislation the Alaska constitution must have the approval of the Congress prior to admission of Alaska as a State of the Union, I take especial pleasure in presenting here the constitution written by the 6 women and 49 men who served as delegates:

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA (Preamble)

We the people of Alaska, grateful to God and to those who founded our Nation and pioneered this great land, in order to secure and transmit to succeeding generations our heritage of political, civil, and religious liberty within the Union of States, do ordain and establish this constitution for the State of Alaska.

ARTICLE I

Declaration of rights

Inherent Rights

SECTION 1. This constitution is dedicated to the principles that all persons have a natural right to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the enjoyment of the rewards of their own industry, that all persons are equal and entitled to equal rights, opportunities, and protection under the law, and that all persons have corresponding obligations to the people and to the State.

Source of Government

SEC. 2. All political power is inherent in the people. All government originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the people as a whole.

Civil Rights

SEC. 3. No person is to be denied the enjoyment of any civil or political right because of race, color, creed, or national origin. The legislature shall implement this section.

Freedom of Religion

SEC. 4. No law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Freedom of Speech

SEC. 5. Every person may freely speak, write, and publish on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right.

Assembly, Petition

SEC. 6. The right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government shall never be abridged.

Due Process

SEC. 7. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The right of all persons to fair and just treatment in the course of legislative and

executive investigations shall not be infringed.

Grand Jury

SEC. 8. No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the Armed Forces in time of war or public danger. Indictment may be waived by the accused. In that case the prosecution shall be by information. The grand jury shall consist of at least 12 citizens, a majority of whom concurring may return an indictment. The power of grand juries to investigate and make recommendations concerning the public welfare or safety shall never be suspended.

Jeopardy and Self-Incrimination

SEC. 9. No person shall be put in jeopardy twice for the same offense. No person shall be compelled in any criminal proceeding to be a witness against himself.

Treason

SEC. 10. Treason against the State consists only in levying war against it, or in adhering to its enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

Rights of Accused

SEC. 11. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of 12, except that the legislature may provide for a jury of not more than 12 nor less than 6 in courts not of record. The accused is entitled to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be released on bail, except for capital offenses when the proof is evident or the presumption great, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Excessive Punishment

SEC. 12. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Penal administration shall be based on the principle of reformation and upon the need for protecting the public.

Habeas Corpus

SEC. 13. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or actual or imminent invasion, the public safety requires it.

Searches and Seizures

SEC. 14. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses and other property, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. No warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Prohibited State Action

SEC. 15. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed. No law impairing the obligation of contracts, and no law making any irrevocable grant of special privileges or immunities shall be passed. No conviction shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture of estate.

Civil Suits; Trial by Jury

SEC. 16. In civil cases where the amount in controversy exceeds \$250, the right of trial by a jury of 12 is preserved to the same extent as it existed at common law. The legislature may make provision for a verdict by not less than three-fourths of the jury and, in courts not of record, may provide for a jury of not less than 6 or more than 12.

Imprisonment for Debt

SEC. 17. There shall be no imprisonment for debt. This section does not prohibit civil arrest of absconding debtors.

Eminent Domain

SEC. 18. Private property shall not be taken or damaged for public use without just compensation.

Right to Bear Arms

SEC. 19. A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Quartering Soldiers

SEC. 20. No member of the Armed Forces shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner or occupant, or in time of war except as prescribed by law. The military shall be in strict subordination to the civil power.

Construction

SEC. 21. The enumeration of rights in this Constitution shall not impair or deny others retained by the people.

ARTICLE V

The legislature

Legislative Power; Membership

SEC. 1. The legislative power of the State is vested in a legislature consisting of a senate with a membership of 20 and a house of representatives with a membership of 40.

Members; Qualifications

SEC. 2. A member of the legislature shall be a qualified voted who has been a resident of Alaska for at least 3 years and of the district from which elected for at least 1 year, immediately preceding his filing for office. A senator shall be at least 25 years of age and a representative at least 21 years of age.

Election and Terms

SEC. 3. Legislators shall be elected at general elections. Their terms begin on the fourth Monday of the January following election unless otherwise provided by law. The term of representatives shall be 2 years, and the term of senators 4 years. One-half of the senators shall be elected every 2 years.

Vacancies

SEC. 4. A vacancy in the legislature shall be filled for the unexpired term as provided by law. If no provision is made, the governor shall fill the vacancy by appointment.

Disqualifications

SEC. 5. No legislator may hold any other office or position of profit under the United States or the State. During the term for which elected and for 1 year thereafter, no legislator may be nominated, elected, or appointed to any other office or position of profit which has been created, or the salary or emoluments of which have been increased, while he was a member. This section shall not prevent any person from seeking or holding the office of governor, secretary of state, or Member of Congress. This section shall not apply to employment by or election to a constitutional convention.

Immunities

SEC. 6. Legislators may not be held to answer before any other tribunal for any statement made in the exercise of their legislative duties while the legislature is in session. Members attending, going to, or returning from legislative sessions are not subject to civil process and are privileged from arrest except for felony or breach of the peace.

Salary and Expenses

SEC. 7. Legislators shall receive annual salaries. They may receive a per diem allowance for expenses while in session and are entitled to travel expenses going to and from

sessions. Presiding officers may receive additional compensation.

Regular Sessions

SEC. 8. The legislature shall convene each year on the fourth Monday in January, but the month and day may be changed by law.

Special Sessions

SEC. 9. Special sessions may be called by the governor or by vote of two-thirds of the legislators. The vote may be conducted by the legislative council or as prescribed by law. At special sessions called by the governor, legislation shall be limited to subjects designated in his proclamation calling the session or to subjects presented by him. Special sessions are limited to 30 days.

Adjournment

SEC. 10. Neither house may adjourn or recess for longer than 3 days unless the other concurs. If the two houses cannot agree on the time of adjournment and either house certifies the disagreement to the governor, he may adjourn the legislature.

Interim Committees

SEC. 11. There shall be a legislative council, and the legislature may establish other interim committees. The council and other interim committees may meet between legislative sessions. They may perform duties and employ personnel as provided by the legislature. Their members may receive an allowance for expenses while performing their duties.

Rules

SEC. 12. The houses of each legislature shall adopt uniform rules of procedure. Each house may choose its officers and employees. Each is the judge of the election and qualifications of its members and may expel a member with the concurrence of two-thirds of its members. Each shall keep a journal of its proceedings. A majority of the membership of each house constitutes a quorum to do business, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and may compel attendance of absent members. The legislature shall regulate lobbying.

Form of Bills

SEC. 13. Every bill shall be confined to one subject unless it is an appropriation bill or one codifying, revising, or rearranging existing laws. Bills for appropriations shall be confined to appropriations. The subject of each bill shall be expressed in the title. The enacting clause shall be: "Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska."

Passage of Bills

SEC. 14. The legislature shall establish the procedure for enactment of bills into law. No bill may become law unless it has passed 3 readings in each house on 3 separate days, except that any bill may be advanced from second to third reading on the same day by concurrence of three-fourths of the house considering it. No bill may become law without an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of each house. The yeas and nays on final passage shall be entered in the journal.

Veto

SEC. 15. The governor may veto bills passed by the legislature. He may, by veto, strike or reduce items in appropriation bills. He shall return any vetoed bill, with a statement of his objections, to the house of origin.

Action Upon Veto

SEC. 16. Upon receipt of a veto message, the legislature shall meet immediately in joint session and reconsider passage of the vetoed bill or item. Bills to raise revenue and appropriation bills or items, although vetoed, become law by affirmative vote of three-fourths of the membership of the leg-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued February 29, 1956
For actions of February 28, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 34

CONTENTS

Accounting.....23	Feed.....11	Personnel.....8
Civil defense.....12	Flood control.....5	Poultry.....26
Controls.....7	Foreign aid.....17	Prices.....14
Dairy industry.....16	Holidays.....24	Reclamation.....4,10,18,29
Disaster relief.....11,28	Housing.....19,25	Records.....6
Education.....27	Lands.....22	Research.....9
Electrification.....3	transfer.....2	Roads.....20
Family farm.....9	Livestock.....21	Soil bank.....14
Farm labor.....19	Loans.....4	Statehood.....13
Farm program.....1,14	National parks.....22	Surplus commodities.....10

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate continued debate on farm bill. House commenced debate on upper Colorado River storage project. Rep. Dague criticized the farm bill. Rep. Price introduced and discussed disaster flood insurance bill.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 3183, the farm bill (3015) Sen. O'Mahoney objected to a proposed unanimous-consent agreement of Sens. Johnson and Knowland to limit debate on the bill beginning next Monday or Wednesday. (pp. 3016, 3023) Sen. Goldwater inserted the statement of the Secretary before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. p. 3020
2. LAND TRANSFER. Both Houses received a proposed bill from the Interior Department authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey the Baranof Castle site in Sitka to Alaska; to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Agriculture Committee. pp. 3000, 3089
3. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger discussed the cost of electric power in the Pacific Northwest. p. 3012

HOUSE

4. RECLAMATION. Commenced debate on H. R. 3383, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project. pp. 3028, 3062

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8535, to provide for certain conditions on loans made for the construction of irrigation systems (H. Rept. 1822). p. 3089

5. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Philbin urged prompt action on flood control measures for the New England States and inserted a newspaper article citing the imminent flood dangers. p. 3077
6. RECORDS. The Special Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee ordered reported to the full committee S. 2364, to provide for records disposition approval by the head of the agency concerned in relation to records which have been in existence for fifty years or more. p. D172
7. CONTROLS. Received petition from Associated Farmers, Richland County opposing social security and any form of governmental controls. pp. 3091, A1847

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

8. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley urging cooperation and support toward efforts being made for the employment of the physically handicapped and inserted an editorial and article on this subject. p. A1839
9. FAMILY FARM. Rep. LeCompte inserted a letter from Rev. Doggett, director of rural parish in Appanoose County, Ia., expressing concern for the economic welfare of the family-sized farm, and suggesting the development of a better plan for research, production, and distribution of farm products. p. A1840
10. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jackson stating that the proposed upper Colorado River project would provide additional lands for the raising of crops which are already in surplus supply, and inserting a table showing types of crops which would be grown, and whether or not they are supported crops. p. A1841
11. DROUGHT RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson stating that the farm problem is "a confusing and vexing problem," and inserting a newspaper editorial "What's the Matter with the Drought Relief Feed Program?" p. A1842
12. CIVIL DEFENSE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Garnatz expressing his belief that effective civil-defense measures can be taken if the need for them is sufficiently understood by the public, and inserting a report on civil defense activities prepared by the director of the civil defense organization in Baltimore. p. A1842
13. STATEHOOD. Del. Bartlett inserted a newspaper article and an address given by W. W. Egan before the Alaska constitutional convention favoring statehood for Alaska. pp. A1850, A1852
14. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Younger inserted a Farm Management magazine article, "How the Farmer Feels about Benson, Soil Bank, Prices and Politics--Poll Shows Majority Oppose Subsidy--Favor Benson, GOP, and Soil Bank Plan." p. A1855
Extension of remarks of Rep. Dague stating that, with reference to the pending farm bill, "there is now under debate in the other body one of the most unsound, unrealistic, and wholly demagogic bills that has ever been presented to any Congress," and inserting a newspaper editorial, "Get Politics Out of Farm Support Bill." p. A1875

It seems to me that the deficiency is exactly the kind of weakness in our commercial insurance system that can be met only by Government action.

The resources of the commercial companies are not adequate to meet the need. No one can accurately predict where a tornado or hurricane or flood will strike. It is popularly supposed, for example, that tornadoes usually occur in the Midwest and the South. Yet in June of 1953 a tornado of devastating force hit the city of Worcester, Mass. The hurricanes, tidal waves and floods resulting from hurricanes used to punish the State of Florida; in recent years they have been striking the Carolinas, Virginia, New England, and the reaches of Canada.

The Banking and Currency Committees acknowledges, I believe, that in setting up a system of Government-inspired insurance against the loss arising from natural disasters it is necessary to move with caution. No one knows exactly how to calculate the cost of the system. No one knows precisely what types of natural disaster should be included in the system when it is inaugurated. The Congress needs the advice and counsel of experts, even though the statistics available to these experts are not all inclusive.

Certain facts, however, are inescapable. First, as our population grows and as investment expands, the potential damage from natural disaster obviously increases. Second, there are great gaps in the system of commercial insurance now available. Third, certain types of loss—such as loss from damage to crops and loss resulting from floods and rising water are not now covered by American commercial companies and are not likely to be covered by private companies in the future. Fourth, the generosity of the American people and the emergency relief offered by such fine organizations as the Red Cross are no longer adequate to meet the serious economic needs.

It seems to me that the appropriate committees of this body and the Senate are exploring a field of great importance in holding hearings on measures to establish a Government system of natural-disaster insurance. I would urge them to consider earnestly the importance of action and the importance of including, if possible, insurance against loss from damage to growing crops as well as damage of other kinds from floods and tornado-caused ground water.

I am today introducing a bill to establish a Government system of insurance. Some 40 such measures already have been offered, and I am aware that the distinguished committee has already conducted some 3 weeks of hearings on the proposals. It is my earnest hope that the distinguished chairman [Mr. SPENCE] may feel that the time is ripe for resuming consideration of the proposals, if in his judgment that is wise, and that the committee may decide that it is possible to report a bill for consideration by the House itself. I have done all that I could to help set in motion the appropriate processes now available for help to the hard-hit citizens of the 2d district, but I am aware—as all of us are, I think—that what is now available

is not sufficient to meet the need when an area and its people are struck by unforeseeable natural disaster. A carefully planned system of Government-encouraged or Government-guided insurance would come much closer to meeting the need.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House that again today we have had more railroad accidents. I am advised that in Swampscott, Mass., this morning there was a serious railroad accident causing the death of 16 persons and injuring hundreds of passengers. I am informed that a seven-car stainless steel train enroute from Portsmouth, N. H., to Boston, Mass., plowed into the rear of a four-car Budd train that was stopped at the time during a heavy snowstorm. It is very apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, that these railroad accidents are becoming more and more frequent. We had our troubles sometime ago with the New Haven Railroad. And now these accidents are on the Boston and Maine Railroad. Last Friday night in the Cambridge-Boston district, a number were injured when an accident happened in that area. The reason given by them was that somebody had pulled the emergency stop signal. As a result of that accident, a number of people had to be sent to the Massachusetts General Hospital for immediate attention. Mr. Speaker, as one who rides frequently on the railroad, it is hard for me to believe that anybody would pull a stop emergency signal and cause such an accident. It is very apparent to me that many of these unfortunate accidents to these railroad riders come about as a result of the railroad curtailing on the help from time to time and also as a result of the fact that the equipment is not in proper condition. For that reason today, Mr. Speaker, I am filing a resolution which I am including as part of my remarks, and I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will investigate these accidents not alone in my own State of Massachusetts but in New England generally.

House Resolution 412

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the factors contributing to railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the railroad accidents which have recently occurred in the New England area, for the purpose of determining the best available methods for preventing the occurrence of similar accidents in the future.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am today, like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], introducing a resolution providing that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Congress investigate the accidents which appear to be occurring almost weekly. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the last 4 days there have been 4 accidents on the Boston & Maine Railroad which goes through my district as well as the district of my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. I do not believe that we can, at this particular stage, fix the blame, Mr. Speaker. There was a very bad snowstorm going on in Massachusetts when the accident occurred this morning, but I, like my colleague [Mr. LANE], have been deeply concerned over the lack of maintenance and equipment on some of these roads. Something must be done.

I called the White House a few moments ago and asked them down there to exercise all the authority at their disposal to take action in this regard so that we can prevent as far as humanly possible these recurring accidents.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I am a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I, too, hope that there will be a prompt investigation to establish the facts in regard to these very unfortunate accidents.

I hope also that the Interstate Commerce Commission on its own initiative will start an investigation to determine these facts as quickly as possible. Those who have served with the Boston & Maine Railroad and all the other great railroads are entitled to the full facts now.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

EMPLOYMENT IN SHIPYARDS AND NUCLEAR POWER

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the time is not far off when all ships, both naval and private, will be propelled by atomic power. The first surface ship, a light cruiser, is included in the fiscal 1957 construction program.

Obviously, it will be necessary to have trained personnel in all shipyards to install and service this new type of power. A knowledge of nuclear reactors is something that can be acquired only by advance study and training. In my own district in the State of Washington, I have been gratified to find that recently 4 workers were nominated for a 1-year course at the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology. Also, I am informed that certain other engineers will attend classes in the navy yard for the purpose of creating a nucleus of trained personnel to teach this important subject to other skilled workers and, finally, I was pleased to learn that the University of Washington will establish classes for those who desire study in this new field.

Because our first use of atomic propulsion will be in combat vessels, it does not follow that only the workers in public yards should have training available to them. I hope that Members of Congress who are on the appropriate committees will see to it that equal opportunity is afforded to the personnel of private shipyards for schooling in the adaptation of nuclear reactors for marine propulsion.

Along this line, I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that recently private industry hired away from the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard two men who are skilled in the atomic field. These men may still be available for Government work, but it would appear to me that Members of Congress should see to it that incentive in the way of pay and retirement in Government service is comparable to private industry so that we can retain engineers and skilled workers who are necessary to install and maintain the reactors for our Navy.

President Eisenhower has said the United States is making available for sale or lease 88,000 pounds of uranium 235—\$1 billion worth—for power production, one-half in this country and one-half for foreign use, not including, of course, the Soviet bloc. We are truly waging peace by emphasizing and promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It would seem to me, however, that more know-how among American technicians and workers is needed. Are we going to have the skilled workers to install, maintain, and operate atomic powerplants and utilize this uranium 235?

Often one hears it said we have a cloak of unnecessary secrecy over much atomic information. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the workers of America are not being overlooked. Opportunities to progress are their right, just as it is the right of America to have a skilled work force trained to make the most of this atomic age. Know-how can be our greatest resource.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 408, Rept. No. 1823), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 311 and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Barden	Denton	Hays, Ohio
Bell	Eberharter	Horan
Bentley	Edmondson	James
Boland	Fascell	Jenkins
Bonner	Fogarty	King, Pa.
Bowler	Fountain	McCulloch
Boykin	Fulton	McDowell
Carriag	Gamble	McIntire
Celler	Garmatz	Macdonald
Chatham	Gavin	Morrow

Metcalf
Miller, N. Y.
Mollohan
Morgan
Morrison
Mumma
Osmers

Poage
Powell
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Rains
Simpson, Pa.

Tollefson
Van Zandt
Watts
Wharton
Williams, Miss.
Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF PATENT RIGHTS TO CERTAIN WARTIME INVENTIONS

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 409, Rept. No. 1824), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2128) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS

Mr. O'NEILL (on behalf of Mr. MADSEN), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 410, Rept. No. 1825), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order to not only enable the needs of America of today, and of 10 years or more, to be met, we must plan and build now.

As we view the world of today and look into the future, as far as we can with reasonable certainty, we see a nation in the next 12 years with a population of 200 millions of persons, and in a few generations, with a population in excess of 300 million. At the present time, the increase in our population is at the rate of about 3 million persons a year.

With this increased population will come increased demands for services and essentials of life and of industry and of national character. This will be particularly so in the field of water resources.

America is blessed with great natural resources, and among them are our great rivers, the resources of which are now, in the main, going to waste. If these resources are marshaled and utilized, and capable of the great use not only now but in the future, it will be for the best interests of our people and our country. In order to meet the demands that exist now, and which will rapidly increase, as we can foresee, we should act now to stop the wasting of our great resources. In doing this, we are building for the future.

In the pending bill, we are making an investment which in terms of money will be returned manifold, but greater, in terms of happiness, to countless of American families will be of inestimable value; and in terms of benefit to our country, will be unlimited.

We must bear in mind that our organic reclamation legislation goes back to 1902. For it was during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt that the National Reclamation Act of 1902 was enacted into law. It was nurtured under Theodore Roosevelt, and under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman it blossomed into nationwide action and benefits. And the projects built and completed during the past 50 years have been an investment beneficial not only to the area served, but to the country as a whole. For an important element in the growth of our country is reclamation and water-resources development.

In terms alone of conserving our water for personal use, our country now has a challenge in various sections; and in the near future, it will be a national challenge.

The mere fact that we live in a section of the country removed from the wide section that this great project will immediately serve, and because of geographical residence alone, as a result of which we have no immediate or special interest, is no reason why we should vote against this or any other worthwhile

project. We should not view projects of this kind from a sectional angle. We should view them from a national angle and the national interests.

The Colorado River storage project, now before us, while somewhat different from the Senate bill, calls for an integrated system of dams and storage reservoirs to regulate and control the waters of the upper Colorado Basin covering major parts of four of our great States—Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. In this great area, water alone is of vital importance.

In the immediate intermountain region, the Colorado River with its tributaries constitutes the greatest source of water. From its source, the Colorado River and its tributaries flow into the Gulf of California. It is a great project for a great country, the authorization and completion of which will make a great contribution to the future growth and welfare of our country. Involved is not only the question of water for personal use, but also reclamation and power and other favorable results that will be of great benefit, not only in the area served, but nationwide. The completion of this project will, through its controlled features, preserve millions of acre-feet of water now permitted to escape in eroding fury during wet years. It will assure the lower basin States of a constant and dependable source of water for the indefinite future.

It is interesting to note that in connection with this project, that although large quantities of electric power will be generated if the dams are built, the power aspect is considered a byproduct of the dam's purpose.

In past years we have witnessed great fights in this body to have enacted into law and to make the necessary appropriations for the construction of great projects in different sections of the country. We know as we look back that each and everyone of them have contributed to the progress of America. This great project is another step, another contribution to the progress of our country.

After many years of legislative effort and struggle, this project is before the Congress in its final legislative stages. Without regard to what section of the country we live in, let us view this project with vision and with courage, recognizing its needs not only for the immediate future, but the great benefits that will come to our country in the decades that lie ahead.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and to vote for the substitute bill that will be offered by the committee and upon final passage to vote for the bill, for authorizing projects of this kind today means a stronger America tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that before he left Washington I spoke with Speaker RAYBURN about this matter. He is away on a very unfortunate journey. We hope and pray, all of the Members, for the quick recovery of his loved one. Speaker RAYBURN told me that he strongly supports the passage of the substitute bill, as I do, which will be offered by the committee to the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have sought this time in order to say that I shall support this rule and shall support the bill, and I sincerely hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill will be passed. As I am quite sure at least most of you know a measure dealing with this problem has already passed the other body, and that by a substantial vote. I think it is fair to say that the measure as it passed the other body in many respects goes much farther than the bill that is presently before us.

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter has been long under consideration. It has been the subject of great controversy. It has been debated in Congresses in the past. I am quite convinced that the time has come to resolve the matter and to go ahead with the enactment of this measure, which, I am sure, is in the national interest.

Now, as everyone knows, I come from the State of Indiana. My district is not in the area directly affected by this project, so I have no direct sectional interest in it. But, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts who just preceded me, I think this is one of those measures where we are called upon to look at the broad national interest and what is best for our country rather than in any sectional interest. And that is not to say that in the passage of this measure can I find anything of adverse effect to my particular section.

I have given the whole matter such study as I could. I have tried to become informed about it. I do not claim to be too well advised about all of the intricate details that are involved in the legislation. But, having weighed the matter as best I can and knowing also that there are many conflicting views—and certainly those in opposition have my utmost respect—I am convinced that this bill should be passed.

Let me say here that it is not my intention to inject at this point or at any point any politics in this measure, because there should be no politics in the consideration of such a measure as this, but there have been some charges at times that those of us who sit on our side of the aisle are unmindful of the necessities for programs of reclamation in various sections of the country. Now, I think the record clearly discloses that any such charge as that is far from the truth. I well recall that as the majority leader in the 80th Congress I did my part in the appropriation of funds for reclamation that I think exceeded in their total any such sums theretofore appropriated by any Congress. I well recall that in the 83d Congress, as the majority leader, I scheduled for action a project somewhat similar to this known as the Arkansas-Fryingpan project. I did what I could to bring that measure to successful passage, and in that effort I was supported by an overwhelming majority of the Members on our side. But, as you know, history has it that that measure was defeated. Also, in that 83d Congress, I was happy to do my part in

scheduling for action and bringing to passage the Trinity River project. Of course, in this Congress we have already passed measures for the Washita and Ventura projects.

In order that the matter may be perfectly clear—and possibly I should address these remarks primarily to my colleagues on my side of the aisle—I will recall that back in 1950 we Republicans in the Congress undertook to draft a statement of principles and policies. It was my responsibility to take a primary part in that because I was chairman of the House committee of three on the drafting of that statement. The committee of three Republicans from the other body was headed by the late great Senator, Bob Taft. In that statement we said that we supported “continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation.”

Then in the 1952 platform of our party, having to do with Public Works and Water Policy we said this:

The Federal Government and State and local governments should continuously plan programs of economically justifiable public works. We favor continuous and comprehensive investigations of our water resources and orderly execution of programs approved by the Congress.

Then we come on down to the 1955 state of the Union message, and amplify it further, when President Eisenhower said this:

The Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.

I am also permitted to say that in recent weeks and months the President has again stressed the sincere conviction on his part that this measure is in the national interest; that it is for the good of the country, and should be passed. As a matter of fact, it was no longer ago than this morning at the White House, at our leadership meeting, that the President again urged us to do everything we could to bring about the passage of this measure.

As a matter of fact, the whole problem of water conservation is one of the most important things before the country. In many places, on occasion, we have too much water. On occasion, water can be like fire. Fire is good at the right place, but if it gets out of hand, it can be very bad, very destructive. The same can be said of water.

At the moment, today, there is going on out in my district a hearing having to do with flood control. I would be there as would my adjoining colleague, Mr. MADDEN of Indiana, but for our legislative responsibilities here. There are other times when we do not have enough water and the problem then is how shall we undertake to control this matter of our water resources.

Let me say to my friends out in my section of the country, this problem of the conservation of our water resources

for the uses that are necessary is not confined alone to the intermountain country, or the West, or the arid areas. It was not so long ago that I had occasion to be in a discussion with the president of one of the biggest industries in the Middle West, the headquarters of that company being in Cincinnati. We got to talking about the availability of water for industrial and other uses and he said that while on occasion the Ohio gets up to flood stage, there come times in the season when water is at the lowest point. He predicted that in 20 years Cincinnati would experience difficulty because of a shortage of water for industrial purposes.

So, while at the moment I suppose the matter of water is of much greater interest to the people in the western arid and semiarid areas, let us not forget that the time may well come when these same problems will be besetting us.

The upper Colorado project provides for storage and for the conservation of water for use. I am quite sure that much of the water that would be saved for beneficial use, if this measure is passed and these projects are carried out, would be of tremendous value not only to that section of the country but other sections as well, and to the country as a whole, instead of going to waste as it does now at certain seasons of the year, flowing into the ocean.

The upper Colorado project was proposed after decades of negotiations, agreements, and research. Perhaps the most significant event leading up to the present project was the formulation in 1922, 34 years ago, of a unique and comprehensive document known as the Colorado River compact. This compact was approved by the seven States of the Colorado River Basin and is recognized by the Congress of the United States and by the President as the law of the river.

This document is unique in that it divided the waters of the river on a basis of equity before any major development was undertaken. It was recognized early that there was not enough water there for all of the use that might be developed, so the compact prepared the way for the development of the area known as the lower basin of the Colorado River, including principally California, Nevada, and Arizona. Such magnificent structures as Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, Parker Dam, and the All American Canal followed this compact, with benefit to the lower basin. The upper basin States, where 90 percent of the water of the Colorado River originates, are now ready to proceed with a similar development. This program has taken years to plan, years to prepare for your consideration today. It has been devised by the Bureau of Reclamation, by the Senate, by House committees, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and it has received, as I have said before, the wholehearted endorsement and support of the President of the United States.

The total depletion of water from the river in the upper basin, including all present projects, will be approximately 4 million acre-feet annually. This, I am informed, is well within the 7½ million

acre-feet allocated to the upper basin by the compact.

This, then, as I see it, is a project planned in accord with a compact and meeting the terms of that compact. On moral and legal grounds I say it is right. It gives to the four States in the upper basin what so far as I am concerned was clearly contemplated when the compact was drawn.

From the standpoint of benefits to the Nation it also is right. It will create new markets for goods manufactured in other parts of the Nation. It will provide for development of the raw materials and other natural resources in an area that has become known as the mineral treasure chest of the Nation. It is advantageous to national defense. It will strengthen a large area, and when any region is strengthened our Nation grows greater. This has been the history of the past and it will be the history of the future as long as we seek and plan for progress.

I think it should be clearly understood that one obstacle to the enactment of this legislation last year has been removed, and that is the Echo Park Dam, that met with the strong opposition of conservationists all over the country. That has been removed.

So I urge your support of the Colorado River storage project because it meets the provisions of an honorable compact, because it has firm justification in benefits that will accrue to the Nation as a whole, because it will aid national defense, and because it will be another step forward for our Nation in the development of our own resources.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, should this matter be disposed of on the rule, it would be a matter of disposing of money at the rate of \$83 million a minute when you consider the cost of this project. I think this Congress would hardly want to handle such a difficult, complex, and expensive problem in that cursory fashion. Therefore, although I shall probably vote against the rule for the purpose of indicating my opposition to the legislation I do feel it deserves a great deal of consideration, more than can be given in the short hour provided on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

[Mr. SAYLOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] and I may extend our remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills, H. R. 9588 and H. R. 9589, to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act for the purpose of building what is known as the Interstate System. The purpose of introducing these bills is to provide the funds to reimburse the various States for highways already built or under construction that will be designated as part of the Interstate System. Taking my own State of New York, in which I am very much interested, we realized a number of years ago the great necessity and the importance of building highways. Just as rapidly as possible, we have moved ahead to the end that now we are completing what is known as the New York State Thruway, part of the Interstate System, which runs from New York State to Buffalo and beyond that point, a total of almost 600 miles at a cost of approximately \$900 million.

Under the present Fallon bill, H. R. 8836, on which hearings are being held before the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, credits are provided, but no funds or formula for paying the credits. The bills I have introduced provide two methods. One bill provides that the reimbursement money necessary be deducted over a period of years from the total sum of \$24,800,000,000 authorized in the bill. The second bill increases the money authorized to \$27,800,000,000 to provide the reimbursement money necessary under the credits provided.

New York State, and several other States, that have moved ahead to meet their obligations of both their economy and national defense and have built their highways in accordance with Federal specifications, would be penalized unless the provisions of these bills are enacted.

I might point out that New York State is not only penalized in this instance because it is and has been progressive in building necessary facilities. The same thing applies to school legislation and other types of Federal aid because, while funds are voted by the Congress to assist various States in the Union that have not kept up with the times, New York will provide a great deal of the tax money necessary to assist in meeting the current and future demands. But there is never provision in legislation to reimburse New York and the several other States for facilities built and for which the taxpayers of the State will be paying off the bonds for many years to come. This to me is unfair and unjust. I am joined in this feeling by my Republican colleagues from the State of New York. I might further add that the Governor of the State of New York has sent letters to all of the members of the New York congressional delegation requesting the reimbursement features embodied in these bills. The chairman of the New York State Republican Committee has also taken this position and has gone on record supporting these reimbursement features. I offer these bills as amendments to present bills being discussed to provide the money that is necessary.

I have also embodied in these bills a section providing that, under all the contracts for the construction of these highway projects in the national system, the contractors and subcontractors pay to all laborers and mechanics wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act—40 United States Code, section 276-a. Last year I supported this provision in the bill that was defeated, and again I support it as a matter that is just and fair to the laborers and mechanics throughout our country.

I shall bend every effort and seek the support of the Members of the House that the provision for reimbursement as well as the prevailing wage sections be injected into any highway legislation that comes before this House and is acted upon by the membership. Highways are sorely needed throughout our country. I support this to the fullest extent, but I am also cognizant of the fact and have been for many years that, while a great portion of the taxes paid into the Federal Government and expended for relief and aid to many parts of our country comes from New York State, very little filters back to the taxpayers of the State of New York, and, when I refer to the State of New York, I also have in mind other States, such as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, California, and several others.

JUSTICE UNDER FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and neighbor in Nassau County [Mr. BECKER] has today introduced jointly with my colleague [Mr. PILLION] two bills which seek to alleviate, by amendment, some of the inequities of H. R. 8836. As a member of the New York State delegation, I am continuously aware of the great burden thrown upon the taxpayers of my State, in support of Federal projects, and I commend my two colleagues for their timely action.

These two bills provide for appropriate repayment and credits for interstate roads already constructed, not merely by intent, but specifically, and provide for recognition of the Davis-Bacon Act in the employment of laborers and mechanics on initial construction work. In order to design a highway bill which will in reality aid our 48 States in the construction of their roads, it is essential that they be included in any measure upon which we are asked to vote.

The present highway bill will be much the better if the aforementioned amendments are adopted.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my friend from southern California has indicated there will be no attempt to defeat the rule on this measure. I agree with him that it would be impossible in the short time that we have to attempt to dispel the fog, or, I should say, smog, with all deference to my friend from southern California, that has been cast over this measure.

I think our minority leader properly advised you when he said that this measure has been under consideration for a good many, many years, not the exact measure before you today, but the general investigation of this project.

During the last 7 years more than \$10 million has been spent in engineering investigations alone on the feasibility of this project. Some of the greatest engineers in this land have been at work on it, the same engineers who designed and helped construct the Hoover Dam, Shasta, Parker, Davis Dam, Hungary Horse, and other great dams in this country.

This matter has also been considered about as thoroughly, or more thoroughly, by the committees of this Congress than any measure—at least any measure that has been before our House Interior Committee.

The other body considered the matter for a good many, many weeks; it came up for consideration in the Senate and was passed by a vote of 58 to 22.

When the matter was considered before your House committee in 1954 it was impossible to bring it to the floor for action before adjournment. It was also considered for a good many weeks last year; and, of course, this year also. I believe there have been more weeks of hearings on this measure than any measure before the committee.

The bill was reported out of committee by a vote of 20 to 6. Of course, it has passed the Rules Committee, and it is now before you.

I simply call these matters to your attention to indicate that we are not coming before you with a hastily drawn or ill-conceived measure.

Since as far back as 1922 when these waters were divided between the lower basin States and the upper basin States, there have been continuous investigations. I might also state that in the Boulder Canyon Act a provision was included that part of the revenue from the Hoover Dam was to go into investigations of projects in the upper basin States so they could go ahead and develop their projects. This money, together with money put up by the States themselves, has gone into these investigations. To us in the arid States where we have less than 12 inches of rainfall a year, I want to assure you that this is a matter of life and death.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman from Indiana suggested a thought which to me is rather persuasive in reaching a decision on this issue, and that is that it is presently proposed to extend to the upper Colorado Basin the same extent of Federal aid or Federal participation that has previously been given in the development of the lower Colorado.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and I may also state the total amount of expenditures made in the lower basin States taking into consideration reclamation, flood control, power, and so forth is tremendous.

dous. The amount of reclamation money that has been spent in southern California is absolutely fabulous.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I must refuse to yield. I have only a short time and wish to complete my statement.

I would simply like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when the Hoover Dam, was constructed, as the gentleman from Indiana said, it was provided, and the State of California was required to and did enter into a limitation agreement providing that they would not take any more water than was provided in the limitation act; and the Colorado compact divided the waters half to the lower basin and half to the upper basin.

We have been all these years trying to get our water divided among ourselves, and our projects developed. Now we come before the Congress with a comprehensive plan to permit us to go ahead with the development.

I would also like to remind you that 99 percent of this money will be paid back, the major portion of it with interest. We are taxing our lands and purchasing the water and power to help pay for it. The power that is to be generated will be sold in our own area. All we are asking is for an advance of these funds, the major portion of which is going to come out of the reclamation fund made up of moneys collected from our own States. In my State of Utah 73 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government. The Government receives oil and gas revenues from my State which go into the reclamation fund. We feel it is our own money. We are asking for the right to use it and the Reclamation Act provides it cannot be used for any other purpose than to construct reclamation projects.

All we are asking is for our own money and the opportunity to work out our own destiny.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will pass the rule which will give the House an opportunity to listen to 4 hours of honest, sincere debate on the upper Colorado River project. If you do not care to hear the debate, perchance, you might read the arguments, pro and con, in the quiet of your office or of your study. But, because of the importance of this legislation it is absolutely necessary that both sides have an opportunity to be heard. It was reported by the Interior Committee by a 20-to-6 vote with 3 not voting.

We are not dealing, in this legislation, with a matter that can be resolved in terms of hours, days, or years. It is not a matter of States, areas, or localities, but of all the United States. We are dealing more specifically with a matter that will find its place in the future of every man, of every woman, and every child in the United States of America, for future generations to come.

I want to say, in all frankness, that with the adoption of this rule we will be able to show that it has the support of this administration and complete bipartisan support of the Congress. We will show that it is economically feasible; we will show that its engineering is correct, that it will pay back to the Treasury the money that is invested in the development of this resource. We will show that southern California will not lose one drop of water guaranteed them under the compact of 1922. We will demonstrate and show, to your satisfaction, that the bill does not cost \$4 billion or untold millions, to every State in the Union. We will show that the land to be irrigated eventually under this development is only about 132,000 new acres, not 586,000 acres as the opponents would have you believe. We will show that it will help the Navaho Indians and the good people of this tribe.

When the Colorado River compact was entered into nearly a quarter of a century ago, California, and lower basin States, under this compact were allocated 7½ million acre-feet of water each year. The same amount was allocated to the four upper States. Water was also promised to Mexico.

Southern California, under the Colorado compact made in 1922, approved and signed in 1928 the building of Hoover, Davis, Parker, and Imperial Dams, and also the Palo Verde weir. Much of this construction was under the guise of flood control and did not cost southern California one thin dime. Southern California has prospered fabulously under the wise use of this stored water. They have had a tremendous economic growth because of the electricity produced at the several dams. The city of Los Angeles could not exist without the long canal giving water from the dams to the city. I am glad they have had that growth. It is part of a growing, dynamic America.

In my judgment, the key to the economy of the West rests in the ability of its people to control two of their great natural resources—land and water. Without the electric power generated from the Hoover Dam, the industrial cities of southern California would not exist. The great Northwest has had its remarkable development because of the projects on the Columbia River. There would be no Los Angeles, no Spokane, Seattle, or Long Beach, as we know them today, if it were not for the men in Congress, in the Government, and in all walks of life who had the vision and the courage to build these projects.

The upper States in the Colorado River project now are asking for their 7½ million acre-feet of water. They are asking that it be stored in reservoirs and that eventually about 132 million acres of land will receive water. They are asking that electric energy be developed, and, indeed, about two-thirds of the money for this project is for the development of electric energy and will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest.

The great growth of southern California can be attributed to the wise use of water and electric energy. The same stability and growth of communities in

the upper basin States will become a reality when this project is in full force and effect.

The upper Colorado project has been the subject of one of the more strenuous public campaigns in many years. Your desk has been flooded with propaganda from the Colorado River Association, with offices at 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Before the debate is ended, I am sure that many of you will realize that much of this propaganda has no basis in fact. Propaganda that this would cost other States millions of dollars has no basis in fact. The engineering feasibility has been established. All these facts will be established.

The project has been conceived and designed by some of the most sincere and capable experts who have had the benefit and experience dating back to the designing and construction of the Hoover Dam. I am sure that Members of Congress must be confused because of the statements and counterstatements relative to this project. The only way these misunderstandings and confusions can be resolved is to listen to or read the debate which will follow on the passage of this rule.

What we are considering in this bill is a matter of extreme national interest. It will permit the people in the upper States to utilize the water guaranteed them by the solemn compact with the States in the lower basin, and it will permit another forward step in the development of the national resources in the United States of America.

A rule has been granted that will permit discussion on this legislation which is so important to our welfare. The rule recognizes that amendments might be necessary to make this a better piece of legislation.

I would like to make it clear that I have no personal interest in this legislation. My State will receive no water and not one kilowatt of electricity will be delivered in Nebraska from any of this project. I am interested because I believe the project to be a vital part in the future of a growing, dynamic America. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

You may not agree with the proponents or opponents, but I trust you will permit the Congress to work its will by free and open discussion on this vital legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that the 7½ million acre-feet under the Sante Fe compact goes to all the lower basin States. I do not want the gentleman to give away all of Arizona's water in such a cavalier manner. Arizona is a State in the lower basin and certainly expects to share in that 7½ million acre-feet. California has, by her own act, limited herself to 4.4 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct; thank you.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would just like to say at this point that there are arguments on the other side as to whether or not the 4.4 million acre-feet to California and the other water to the lower basin is imperiled by this project, and I shall discuss it further.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will. In the judgment of many, California's water will not be affected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is faced today with probably one of the most complicated measures which we have had to consider in this 84th Congress. The time of 4 hours, I am sure, will be used to the full by those who are for and against this measure. It is my hope that during the time of that 4-hour debate many of us who believe this bill should be defeated can appeal to the reason and good judgment of the Members of this House to the point where this bill can be defeated. The Members from southern California, on both sides of the aisle, may be placed by the proponents of this bill in a false position. They say that we are water hogs, that we want all the water in the river, and all that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, this compact has been in controversy for more than 25 years. Over 20 interstate commissions have tried to get together to determine what is the meaning of the Colorado River compact. At this very time, as a result of a suit by the State of Arizona against the State of California, the matter is before the Supreme Court for the determination of the meaning of the compact.

There are at least 12 different points that the people in southern California honestly and sincerely feel should be clarified. The only place we can get that clarification, interstate conferences having failed, is before the Supreme Court of the United States.

We have rested our case before the Supreme Court and we are ready and willing to abide by the opinion of the Supreme Court when it comes, whatever that opinion may be. It may be contrary to the belief of southern California. On the other hand, it may support some of our beliefs as to what the compact means. But we honestly and sincerely believe that this tremendous and complicated piece of legislation should not be passed while there is pending in the Supreme Court a suit between States of the compact, which will affect all of the States within the compact; the clarification of which will affect the rights of the separate States, including that of southern California. We feel our contractual rights are in jeopardy. We know of no other way to find out than to seek the judgment of the Supreme Court. We do not want any ill feeling between neighboring States. The Members from California have stood aside on 10 different occasions when legislation conferring benefits upon the upper basin States has been offered. We supported the compact for the upper basin and the approval of the contract by the Congress.

We have been willing that money that comes from Hoover Dam go to the upper basin States for engineering projects over the years. We are not a dog in the manger on this project. We merely seek to protect our rights.

We have 6 million people in southern California that are depending upon the water from the Colorado. And I should like to say that the municipalities and the irrigation districts and water districts of California have expended over \$700 million in aqueducts, irrigation ditches, and transmission lines from Hoover Dam.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. If the decision of the Supreme Court is in favor of southern California, what effect would that have upon the project as it is presented to the House?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In my opinion, if the Supreme Court should recommend in favor of southern California's interpretation of the compact, it would protect our rights under the compact. But if it should rule against our interpretation of the compact, we fear we would lose some of that protection.

Mr. DIES. That is not quite the question. What I want to know is, if southern California won the case would that change the nature and effect of the project; would it destroy the project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. DIES. Or have any effect upon it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, as far as I know; it would not.

Mr. DIES. Then what has the case got to do with the project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It might modify the contract to give protection to southern California for water rights which if it were decided against us would make some of our present contracts null and void.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Also in the case before the Supreme Court is the definition of beneficial consumptive use as it applies to the compact.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. That makes a tremendous difference in this particular instance, because that definition makes a difference between the upper basin and the lower basin as to what net water is available for use; and also there is the matter of something in excess of 2 million acre-feet of water claimed by the Indians that might have to be subtracted from the water available between the lower and the upper basins.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to clarify a point that seemed to be in doubt following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the question as to whether this project came into the same category as far as equal benefits are con-

cerned as the lower Colorado development and the Hoover Dam.

It does not by any means, because before a steam shovel was turned for the building of the Hoover Dam, and that was after years and years of engineering and investigation as to the best location, before a steam shovel was turned there was a firm contract agreed to by California and the Federal Government that California would pay for the cost of Hoover Dam by consuming the power developed at the dam. It was written down and signed and agreed, and that has been lived up to.

This project does not equal that in any sense whatsoever. This project is seeking to obtain all of the money from the Federal Treasury without any assurance of any return except from the result of the sale of the power and the reclamation of the land eventually. That is paying beforehand, while we in California gave every assurance and guaranty of the payment of it before the project was started.

Another thing, so far as the jeopardy of the lower Colorado River water is concerned, is that there is in the minority report a reliable and a very dependable statement made by Raymond Hill and several other engineers. I quote Mr. Hill because I know him personally. I have had personal contact with him. I know his reputation. He was retained as a consulting engineer by the State of Colorado. He gave to the State of Colorado this statement as a result of his survey:

When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry—

That is the dividing point—

to supply the full right of the Metropolitan Water District, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

Here is an engineer's report that that river compact is going to be violated if these projects are put into effect.

The report goes on further to say that the building of the upper Colorado River projects will be disastrous to the lower river States' water supply.

I recommend that the rule be defeated, because I do not think this project is in a form in which it should be debated at this time. It should be recommitted to the committee. More study should be made of it. It is not in a shape in which we should consider it at this time. I am going to vote against the rule just as I voted against the rule the first time it was on the floor, when this House defeated the rule the first time this project was offered to the House for consideration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Has this project ever been before this body before?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This project has never been before this body before.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The rule was defeated.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I beg the gentleman's pardon, the rule was not.

The only reason I take a little time here is to discuss the question of the so-called lawsuit pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. That is just another method that those in southern California are using in an attempt to defeat this bill.

May I outline to you that the people of southern California and all of the people of the Colorado River Basin States agreed on a compact, providing for a division of the water between the upper basin States and the lower basin States. The southern Californians insist that we should deliver to them an average of 75 million acre-feet over a 10-year period. In order to get the Boulder Canyon project approved the State of California by its legislature, adopted a bill which the Congress of the United States directed them to do under no circumstances and under no condition were they to use or attempt to assert any right in excess of 4,400 million acre-feet plus one-half of the surplus thereof. That was in the original Boulder Dam Project Act approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057). Not until this bill began to see the light of day did you ever have southern California or anywhere else, anybody question that compact at all. The southern Californians went to the Supreme Court of the United States and did their best to get the sovereign States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and New Mexico into it for the purpose of then coming before the Congress saying, "You cannot pass it because it is now in the Supreme Court of the United States." The Supreme Court of the United States turned down the request of southern California and said that this compact as it deals with the upper basin States and this compact and this bill, as we expect to pass it, did not in any manner, and would not in any manner affect this bill nor would we be engaged in any litigation whatsoever.

It is my thought, and I think the record will bear it out, that southern California at the time the Hoover Dam was built, agreed, as the gentleman from California said a moment ago, to repay by paying for the energy and for the water. But what did they do? They came to this Congress in 1940, after that contract was entered into wherein they agreed to pay approximately 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the electric energy they wanted at Hoover Dam, and asked this Congress for permission to rewrite that contract. That contract is rewritten and today they are getting that energy for 2¼ mills per kilowatt-hour. That is one of the things they are fighting it for because they know their obligation to pay it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. So that I will not interrupt the gentleman at the high point of his speech, I wonder if the gen-

tleman would tell the House how many acres of new land will be put into cultivation if this legislation passes the House?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to the gentleman that that will all be brought out in debate, however, I will answer it now and say approximately 135,000 acres of new land.

Mr. Speaker, first may I express my deep appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for permitting me to have this much of his all too limited time, and also I wish to thank my very fine and helpful friends, the Speaker pro tempore of this body, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the former floor leader of the House on the Republican side, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for the fine statements that they made in support of the rule. Much of what has been said here during the last half hour, of course, has its place in the debate. My purpose here is to use the time which I have been given to suggest to my colleagues that this legislation is of sufficient significance and importance to have the rule adopted and to proceed to debate.

Naturally, as sponsor of the bill, H. R. 3383, I support House Resolution 311 now under consideration, and sincerely trust that the Members of this honorable body will approve such resolution and make possible full debate of the upper Colorado River project legislation—legislation about which much has been said and publicized, and of which a great part has been misleading.

My residence in the area to be directly served by the project, which will be authorized by the bill under approval of House Resolution 311, began as a boy in 1904. It has been continuous since then. Although I retain a great warmth of affection for the place of my nativity, the district so ably represented by our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], nevertheless, I shall be eternally grateful that my parents found the needed haven in western Colorado when my mother's health made it imperative for us to find a new home.

My forebears helped pioneer and settle many areas of the East. I am happy that the same fate fell to me as far as a part of the Rocky Mountain West is concerned. The place where my home has been for a half century was out from under Indian rule only 20 years when I moved there. I am the only Member of this great body who is an actual resident of the upper Colorado River basin, an area larger than the whole of New England. I believe that I am qualified to tell you of the hopes and ambitions of the people of that undeveloped storehouse of a large quantity of our country's natural-resource values. Here is an area with its people just waiting for the opportunity to make its contribution to the general advancement and welfare of our great Nation. The upper basin area of the Colorado is a land of great promise. Its agricultural resources now limited by the topography of the area can be developed further. Its mineral resources are virtually untapped. I

do not need to advise this body that the upper basin contains the greatest uranium-producing area in this country and perhaps in the Western Hemisphere. Just a few miles from my home lie mountains of oil shale, vast beds of coal and mountains of phosphates—to mention a few of the items comprising the mineral wealth of my area. The same, of course, is true of New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These tremendous mineral deposits with their vast potential benefits for the people of our land, wait only for the availability of power at reasonable rates and the availability of sure supplies of domestic and industrial water. The downrush of the waters of the Colorado will provide the bootstrap by which this area can pull itself up, paying its own way as it goes, and giving incalculable values to the Nation generally.

I stand here in the well of the House with a feeling of great hope that this day will see a generation-old dream come true—a dream of the people of the upper Colorado River Basin area for a rather limited number of new farms, a somewhat greater number of old farms with a sure supply of vital water at some period in the future beginning not earlier than 1964, a limited amount of municipal water development, and electric power as an incidental feature to bring new mines, mills, and factories to develop our abundant resources. If indeed industrialism proceeds as visualized much of the agricultural water will be taken for cities. In it also is the first necessary step in a long-range program to aid a large segment of our Navaho Indians.

We of the upper Colorado River Basin have been working toward this sound development for the better part of this century. Bills to achieve it, following upon negotiation, planning and interstate agreement, have been before the Congress for several years. Now the great effort is at a time of decision—the bill is ready for House action. We of the upper Colorado Basin area and States directly interested therein stand ready to justify the Nation's faith in our plan with our assurances for repayment of the financial credit we here seek. There is no better demonstration of our faith in this project.

I cannot here add dramatic new testimonials to the soundness of this legislation. I would not, if I were able to do so, guild it as the lily, but I know it to be fundamentally sound and worthwhile—worthwhile to the underdeveloped area through which the Colorado River now flows as an erratic and wasting asset, and equally worthwhile to the Nation as well.

This Nation was built by, and has always profited from, the development of its resources. Bonneville, Coulee, Central California, Boulder—all these stand as monuments to the gain for the Nation to be achieved by initial advances from the Government.

I have not time now to refute each dramatic thrust that has been made against this legislation—thrusts made by skillful and well-financed opposition. Such opportunity will be afforded to us with the adoption of the rule under consid-

eration. It is my hope that the facts will be the basis of decision in your case, as it has been in mine. These speak for themselves and speak in solid support for this Federal resource investment.

These facts have grown out of extensive hearings. As chairman of the committee which held these hearings, I made sure that each point of view was fully, even redundantly, heard and considered, whether fact or folly. We did not proceed as partisans or as wastrels, but rather as men seeking to bring to fruition the type of development which has proven to be so valuable in other areas, and to the Nation generally. Evidence of this careful consideration can be found in the newly adopted provisions of the bill excluding and protecting national park and monument areas—which legislative protection was sought by conservation-minded groups. Further evidence is found in our limit on the total appropriation to an amount considerably below the figure approved by the other body, but a figure which we believe to be adequate to do the job.

This is now being submitted to you from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for your judgment. In the reports we have offered facts to undergird the conclusions which resulted from our extensive consideration.

Beyond this, to each of you who have had a question to ask of me, I have given a plain and forthright answer—as your questions deserved. I have not, nor will I now, paint this logical program as a glittering package of indescribable and limitless value, but my colleagues and I shall do our best to present to you its worth and possibilities to the area and Nation. It will provide the economic stimulus for a now underdeveloped area which will enable it to build new farms, new cities, new factories, and create other income and tax-gathering facilities out of which repayment can be made. It is not something new, and for a testimonial of its economic worth and value, just turn your ear to the concerted opposition rising up from southern California which would like to profit from the use of the same water even though they signed solemn agreements that it was not theirs.

I know only too well that all of you have been treated to carefully calculated points of opposition ranging from purported statistical data to side-show routines about rock that dissolves in water. To those of you on my right convinced that you do not favor this legislation, I offer this last chance to join in a new and challenging adventure. To those of you on my left in this same situation I offer the reminder that this is favored by past and present leaders and spokesmen of your great party and has an honorable history back to the administration of the able and dynamic Theodore Roosevelt. It is not a partisan matter at all.

What is it that we propose? We propose at last to control the upper half of the turbulent Colorado River, much as it has been controlled by Federal help in its southern reaches. To do so, we need a giant dam, not as high as Hoover, but more expensive, to tame the erratic

flow. This dam, Glen Canyon, and the falling water from it converted to electrical energy, will enable us to put water to use in development elsewhere for farms, cities and people; for mine and mill and factory. These economic creations will generate the new income necessary to repay the advances made during construction. That is all there is to it. True, the \$760 million figure is a considerable sum, but recall only that the repayment to the Government, in that it involves interest on two-thirds of the features, will be even larger. It is not, unfortunately, enough of a return to attract private industry, but it is enough to bring wealth, net new wealth, new income, new taxes, new markets, to the Nation. That is the criteria upon which I support this legislation. It will provide the necessary development of now underdeveloped resources in a manner that will return the advance. Is it not good enough for you as well?

Just to save a lot of time, I should like to cover in pointed terms what this bill does not contain. I realize that this is perhaps not the best way to approach the virtues of any legislation, but until we clear the tangled underbrush of calculated confusion, we cannot see the trees. There are many interests and groups who fear to have the trees seen lest they be appreciated and approved. Accordingly, they take the devious path of confusion. The upper Colorado storage and development project is not something new, something recently concocted by a bunch of harebrained planners bent on development at any cost. The history of this proposal, rather, goes back before the turn of the century when farseeing men began the development of the arid West by means of irrigation. This development was a key point in the necessity which moved the States along the Colorado to come to binding agreement on the division of its waters which culminated in the Santa Fe compact in 1922. This development was foreseen, supported, and advanced by such farseeing political leaders of our country as Herbert Hoover, Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Calvin Coolidge, and a list of highly respected conservationists too long to include here. Indeed, some of the very dams proposed as a part of this upper basin development were surveyed and contemplated for construction by the lower basin before they settled on a high dam in Black Canyon, since known as the Hoover Dam. This development merely provides for the use of the waters of the Colorado River and this has been contemplated, planned, supported, and advanced by each negotiation, legislative enactment, compact, and proposal since the early settlers were able to see that water was life in the West. This is not to say that all has ever been harmonious or unanimous. Water is the lifeblood of the West, and if I seem repetitious, let it merely indicate a measure of the conflict that has occurred over its control and use. I wish each of you had time to go over the history of the development of this great region stretching from the Rockies to the Gulf of California. I wish you could go back with me over the long negotiations, battles, and final agree-

ments affecting this river. It is a fascinating story with able and energetic characters, a worthwhile plot, and more than adequate drama. It has many authors—men now forgotten, men once famous but now passed into memory, and men who were there and are still available to recount the story in personal terms even though time is taking its toll. It has many side plots and plots within plots, yet it is all a consistent part of the whole drama of development in the Colorado River Basin—and how general development is tied irrevocably to the waters of this great stream.

The bill, consideration of which would be in order upon the approval of the resolution now before us, does not authorize, or even contemplate, the construction of any facility having any adverse effect on any area reserved as a national park or national monument. On the other hand, the legislation as approved by the committee specifically provides for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument should it be endangered by the construction of the Glen Canyon unit. It goes even further and provides that it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be in any national park or monument.

The suggested legislation does not authorize or of necessity contemplate any billion dollar boondoggle to siphon away funds from the National Treasury or economy. In fact, the nonreimbursable cost allocations in this legislation are very small with 99 percent of all the funds advanced by the Federal Government to be repaid in full to the Federal Treasury with those costs allocated to power, and municipal water repayable with interest.

The bill does not involve, either as now presented or originally proposed, any multibillion dollar subsidy to this area of the West. In fact, the legislation contains no authorization for subsidy as the word is so often misused these days. Evidence will be presented by the proponents of the legislation to show that the benefit-cost ratio of this particular project is most favorable to the Nation generally. The plan to be considered by this body does not involve or even contemplate any use of water which will have adverse effect upon present legitimate and legal uses based upon the law of the river at any place along the river, in its basin or in areas now served by waters from the river. In fact, the proponents will show that provisions have been incorporated in the legislation to cause the law of the river to apply in every possible instance. The bill does not involve or even contemplate any sudden or eventual use of the Colorado River water not known to any informed person of the whole area for the last three decades, nor does it involve any theory, proposal or Federal aid not equally well known and previously supported by several States and legal entities of the area now supporting or opposing the present program to be authorized by the legislation to be considered. In fact, it conforms, and in some respects more conservatively, to the established procedures, rules, and regulations for

reclamation developments heretofore authorized by this body.

The bill does not require vast sums of money from other States of the Union to their damage and hurt. In fact, it requires only a limited amount of aid over the necessary construction period from funds other than those available in the revolving reclamation fund. Well-grounded estimates show that in no year during the construction period would the Federal Government be called upon to furnish from the General Treasury more than \$18 million a year, practically all of which would be repayable.

The bill does not involve or even contemplate power costs in excess of that presently charged or available in the foreseeable future for the area to be served; nor does it contemplate hydro power development adversely affecting our diminishing resources of hydrocarbons; nor does it contemplate any program that would adversely affect our nuclear power reactor projects. In fact, the development of the upper Colorado River project would aid the development of the other programs and the power produced would be furnished at a rate benefiting the users.

The bill does not involve or even contemplate the culture of any esoteric food or any crop now in great surplus or in competition with those produced in any other area. In fact, the amount of land to be developed under the project is considerably less in acreage than the amount now being withdrawn from agricultural production for military, municipal, highway, and other uses made necessary by an increasing population, and the progress of our economy.

The bill does not involve any flimsy program hastily thrown together without a thought as to its integration to the needs of the whole area or the Nation. In fact, on the contrary it is a well thought out and well planned project carried as far along in concrete plans and specifications as funds available have permitted. Of course, there is considerable engineering work to be done yet to insure that the various facilities of the project can be constructed effectively, safely, and economically.

The bill does not, of necessity, involve the appropriation of money at a time when the budget may not be exactly balanced. However, with the approachment of the time when the budget is balanced, the much-publicized phony interest and nimble numbers charges would assume their proper perspective and relationship. In fact, the national benefits which would be possible under the authorization after it comes into operation would aid and further our national welfare to a material degree.

The sponsors of H. R. 3383 and companion bills, if given the opportunity, will present in an orderly, and we trust, effective manner the facts and procedures pertinent to the legislation. We respectfully ask for your favorable support of the rule and close attention to the matters which are factually involved.

I wish to suggest to my good colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that it is a rather pleasing experience for me to come this

far along in the consideration of this legislation and find ourselves in mutual agreement at least on one thing and that is that this legislation is sufficiently important to be considered by the House.

May I advise of the amount of consideration that has been given to this bill? More than 125 hours were devoted to the taking of testimony by committees in the 83d and 84th Congresses, and to careful and close consideration of the matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman tell the committee how that time was divided?

Mr. ASPINALL. With the exception of about 6 hours which were given to departmental witnesses to present their case, the time was divided 50-50, 50 percent of the time to the proponents and 50 percent of the time to the opponents.

More than 2,800 pages of printed testimony are available for the Members of this body to study if they see fit.

Of those witnesses who appeared before our committee during the 84th Congress, 38 were basin proponents, 1 was an REA spokesman supporting the bill; 3 were Indian representatives supporting the legislation; 2 were private-utility spokesmen supporting the legislation; 11 were conservationists who were opposed to the legislation at that time; 2 were in general support; 15 southern California witnesses appeared in opposition, and only 1 witness other than this group from southern California appeared in opposition to this legislation.

When my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], suggests that we are bringing to this body an entirely different piece of legislation than that originally put before the House, the gentleman is absolutely mistaken. The germaneness of what is proposed in the amendment has been passed upon by those who are familiar with parliamentary practice before this body.

We have stated we would not attempt to bypass the important Rules Committee in any particular whatsoever.

One of the most important amendments that has been placed in the substitute is to the effect that no national park or monument area shall be trespass upon in the construction of this project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not all of the so-called conservation controversies have been resolved? Is the conservation group satisfied with this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. All of the conservation opposition that was formerly placed before our committee to my knowledge has been withdrawn. Some of them not only have withdrawn their opposition, but they now support this legislation wholeheartedly, as is shown in the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That includes the Sierra Club of California?

Mr. ASPINALL. That includes the Sierra Club of California, under the able leadership of Mr. Brower.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. May I make a correction? Mr. Brower has contacted me within the past few days, continuing to voice his opposition to the proposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. We are not going to get into any argument on that. I have stated what is my opinion.

We have made one change in the substitute which goes to the formula for repayment. We have done this, as you will be advised, in order to see to it that the waters allocated to the upper basin through the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the upper Colorado River compact of 1948 are properly allocated to bring about the use of such allocations heretofore made to the various States. By direction we have attempted to do what the former bill did by indirection. It is the feeling of the committee that this amendment is germane.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman has just referred to a list of interests that have approved the bill. Would the gentleman care to inform the House whether or not the private power companies of Utah, Colorado, and Arizona approve this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall advise the gentleman from New York that there appeared before our committee two representatives of the private power utilities in that area, stating that they represented some 10 private utilities. They advised the committee that they were willing to accept the responsibility of distributing the power that was surplus to the needs of the REA.

Mr. DONOVAN. The answer of the gentleman then is that this bill is all right with the private power utilities of that area; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. In that part of the area we have had friendly operations. They have come into the picture and suggested to us their willingness to accept this responsibility.

Mr. DONOVAN. So that this is one piece of public power legislation in the West that the private power companies do not oppose; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will let the gentleman answer his own question.

Mr. DONOVAN. Would the gentleman care to inform the House as to what knowledge he has as to why the private power utilities concur in this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, some question has been raised here during debate upon the rule as to the propriety of certain actions that will be taken. It is my understand-

ing that the committee proposes to offer an amendment to its bill in the form of a substitute. I take it if the substitute is germane it may be offered. If it is not germane an objection would stop it. Therefore, I see nothing irregular about this procedure. It is perfectly in order.

Mr. Speaker, while I personally am constrained to oppose this bill and vote against it, it is of sufficient importance that the rule should be adopted and full discussion had as is provided under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 354, nays 26, not voting 53, as follows:.

[Roll No. 10]
YEAS—354

Abbutt	Chase	Gathings
Abernethy	Chelf	Gentry
Adair	Chenoweth	George
Addonizio	Christopher	Gordon
Albert	Chudoff	Grant
Alexander	Church	Gray
Alger	Clark	Green, Oreg.
Allen, Calif.	Clevenger	Green, Pa.
Allen, Ill.	Cole	Gregory
Andersen,	Colmer	Griffiths
II. Carl	Cooley	Gross
Andersen,	Coon	Gubser
August H.	Cooper	Gwinn
Anfuso	Corbett	Hagen
Ashley	Coudert	Hale
Ashmore	Cramer	Halleck
Aspinall	Cretella	Hand
Ashincloss	Crumacker	Harden
Avery	Cunningham	Hardy
Ayres	Curtis, Mass.	Harris
Bailey	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Nebr.
Baker	Dague	Harrison, Va.
Baldwin	Davidson	Harvey
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Hays, Ark.
Bass, N. H.	Davis, Wis.	Hayworth
Bass, Tenn.	Davson, Ill.	Healey
Bates	Dawson, Utah	Hébert
Baumhart	Deane	Henderson
Beamer	Delaney	Herlong
Becker	Dempsey	Heseltin
Bennett, Fla.	Derounian	Hess
Bennett, Mich.	Devereux	Hiestand
Berry	Dies	Hill
Betts	Diggs	Hinshaw
Blatnik	Dingell	Hoeven
Boggs	Dixon	Hoffman, Ill.
Boland	Dodd	Hoffman, Mich.
Bolling	Dollinger	Holland
Bolton	Dolliver	Holmes
Frances P.	Donovan	Holtzman
Bolton,	Dorn, N. Y.	Hope
Oliver P.	Dorn, S. C.	Horan
Bonner	Dowdy	Huddleston
Bosch	Doyle	Hull
Bow	Durham	Hyde
Bowler	Edmondson	Ikard
Boyle	Elliott	Jarman
Bray	Ellsworth	Jennings
Brooks, La.	Engle	Jensen
Brooks, Tex.	Evins	Johansen
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Fascell	Johnson, Wis.
Brownson	Feighan	Jonas
Broyhill	Fenton	Jones, Ala.
Buckley	Fernandez	Judd
Budge	Fino	Karsten
Burdick	Fisher	Kearney
Burleson	Fjare	Kearns
Bush	Flood	Keating
Byrd	Fogarty	Kee
Byrne, Pa.	Forand	Kelly, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford	Kelly, N. Y.
Canfield	Forrester	Keogh
Cannon	Frazier	Kilburn
Carnahan	Frelinghuysen	Kilday
Cederberg	Friedel	Kilgore
Celler	Gary	

Kirwan	O'Hara, Ill.
Kluczynski	O'Hara, Minn.
Knox	O'Neill
Knutson	Ostertag
Krueger	Passman
Laird	Patman
Landrum	Patterson
Lane	Pelly
Lanham	Perkins
Lankford	Pfost
Latham	Philbin
LeCompte	Poff
Lesinski	Polk
Long	Preston
Lovre	Price
McCarthy	Prouty
McConnell	Radwan
McCormack	Ray
McDowell	Reece, Tenn.
McGregor	Rees, Kans.
McMillan	Reuss
McVey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Machrowicz	Rhodes, Pa.
Mack, Ill.	Riehlman
Mack, Wash.	Rivers
Madden	Roberts
Magnuson	Robeson, Va.
Mahon	Robson, Ky.
Mailliard	Rodino
Marshall	Rogers, Colo.
Matthews	Rogers, Fla.
Meador	Rogers, Mass.
Metcalf	Rogers, Tex.
Miller, Calif.	Rooney
Miller, Md.	Rutherford
Miller, Nebr.	Sadlak
Miller, N. Y.	St. George
Mills	Saylor
Minshall	Schenck
Morano	Scherer
Moss	Schwengel
Moulder	Scott
Multer	Scrivner
Mumma	Scudder
Murray, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Murray, Tenn.	Selden
Natcher	Sheehan
Nelson	Shelley
Nicholson	Short
Norblad	Sieminski
Norrell	Sikes
O'Brien, Ill.	Siler
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sisk

NAYS—26

Blich	Jackson
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.
Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.
Flynt	Lipscomb
Haley	McDonough
Hillings	Mason
Holfield	O'Konski
Holt	Phillips
Hosmer	Pillion

NOT VOTING—53

Andrews	Garmatz
Arends	Gavin
Barden	Granahan
Belcher	Hays, Ohio
Bell	James
Bentley	Jenkins
Boykin	Jones, Mo.
Burnside	King, Pa.
Carrigg	Klein
Chatham	McCulloch
Chiperfield	McIntire
Denton	Macdonald
Dondero	Martin
Donohue	Merrow
Eberharter	Mollohan
Fountain	Morgan
Fulton	Morrison
Gamble	Osmers

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Riley against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Carrigg.

Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Pelt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. James.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Gamble.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, a recent issue which is entitled "Colorado Moves On."

In speaking of the fate of the bill the editorial says:

It appears the project can be brought to the House for floor debate late this month, leaving no excuse for failing to give it careful consideration and a calm vote.

One may suggest that aside from the Nation's welfare, no time should be lost for the sake of Congressman HOSMER of California. If he is given many more weeks in which to dream up a bigger falsehood than those he has already presented, the consequences can't be foreseen.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial reflects upon my integrity as a Member of this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman send the editorial to the chair?

Mr. HOSMER. I will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman raises a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter, including tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial being couched in the terms it is leaves a question on everything that I have ever said about this project over several long years of effort. I am going to itemize these to you and ask you: True or false? And leave it to your opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I opposed this project because it tramples the water rights of California both as to quantity and to quality. True or false?

Mr. Speaker, I stated, under date of March 16, the reason for my opposition to the upper Colorado basin project because as proposed it would qualify California's right to waters of the river established by compact, contract, and appropriation. This is my full statement:

Southern California Congressmen have been receiving numerous letters from home urging us to oppose the upper Colorado Basin storage project.

For myself, as a member of the committee holding hearings on it, I wish to say that I have devoted the majority of my time to this great battle on behalf of the 6 million southern Californians vitally dependent on the quantity and quality of their lawful share of the water of the Colorado River. We vitally need it for our homes, our farms, and our job-giving industries.

If the day should ever come that Colorado River water failed to flow into our area, on that day Southern California would be changed from an oasis to a desert. On that day, every southern Californian would lose the value of his home and everything else he owns that could not be transported to another part of the country.

In addition, we must protect the almost three-fourths billion dollars we have invested in dams, canals, transmission lines, and other facilities constructed to make use of our share of the water.

All southern California Congressmen have participated wholeheartedly in this nonpartisan battle for southern California's vital interests.

The reason we oppose the upper Colorado Basin storage project is that, as proposed, it would violate California's rights to waters of the river established by compact, contract, and appropriation.

It is a strange, but true, fact that developments on the upper Colorado can proceed without interfering with California's rights.

Thus, our fight is not blindly directed against upper Colorado Basin developments in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. Rather it is against carrying them on in such a way as to trample our water rights.

Whenever these States are willing, in building and operating their projects, to recognize and respect our rights, I believe California's opposition will vanish like a snowball in the hot sun.

We, in the arid West, are all interested in seeing that every possible use is made of that water we have. But we will forever "stand on our ditch" and protect what is rightfully ours.

Southern Californians can become "water vigilantes" and help in this battle. They should write their friends and relatives in other parts of the country to contact their own Congressmen and Senators urging opposition to the upper Colorado project until the legislation contains provisions guaranteeing California's existing water rights.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield. I wish to make my statement. If any time is left I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from California is not speaking to the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This question of personal privilege is one of rather broad latitude.

The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield at this point.

I state further that whenever these States are able to build and operate their own projects, I believe California's opposition will vanish.

Again, on April 28, 1955, I made a similar statement and concluded it must be revamped and redesigned, referring to the upper Colorado River project, so that ultimately it will produce results, not just consequences. True or false? This is the text of the statement:

Strong opposition to the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project has been voiced to the House Interior Committee considering it by southern California's congressional delegation.

Acting as spokesman for the group, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, Long Beach, presented the committee with a 121-page statement summarizing objections and supporting them with detailed economic, engineering, and other data.

The Hosmer statement included the following points:

The project would seriously cut down the amount of water the Golden State could expect from the Colorado River.

The quality of that water would be seriously impaired by a higher concentration of salts and alkalis.

Power generated at Hoover Dam would be reduced by water shortages and to replace it, southland home and industrial consumers would have to pay over \$2 million a year more for power.

Going on to general objections to the project shared by citizens of all the 48 States, HOSMER said:

Lost power revenues during the life of the present Hoover Dam contracts would cost United States taxpayers at least \$187 million.

The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project would cost United States taxpayers an additional \$4 billion, and \$372,800,000 of that amount would be borne by California taxpayers.

The project \$4 billion cost means that the price tag to irrigate each acre in the 600 square miles of farmland involved will be \$5,000. Its products would involve taxpayers in further expenses when purchased as surplus under price-support programs. There is that much land in other areas of the country that can be brought into cultivation later, if needed, at a significantly smaller cost.

The project's vast hydroelectric production facilities must sell power at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the next 100 years to pay for themselves. This will be impossible because of lower cost power developing from nuclear fuels and the facilities will be left on the taxpayers' backs as the most monumental white elephant in history.

The project's Echo Park Dam will invade scenic Dinosaur National Monument with unsightly power facilities.

Utah's famed Rainbow Bridge, the world's largest and most magnificent natural structure of its kind, will be endangered by construction and operation of the project's Glen Canyon power reservoir.

The project will saddle a limited agriculture economy on the upper basin States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico whereas they have unlimited possibilities for the future if left free to develop an industrial economy.

In urging defeat of the project HOSMER concluded, "it must be revamped and redesigned so it ultimately will produce results, not just consequences."

Southern California Congressmen joining HOSMER's general opposition to the project, without specifically committing themselves to any of the particular arguments against it, were: Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, Republican; Representative GORDON MC-DONOUGH, Republican; Representative CECIL KING, Democrat; Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat; Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican; Representative EDGAR W. HESTAND, Republican; Representative JOE HOLT, Republican; Representative CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat; Representative PAT HILLINGS, Republican; Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican; Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, Democrat; Representative JAMES UTT, Republican; Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican, and Representative ROBERT WILSON, Republican.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that California is not opposed to this project on the basis of any loss of low-cost power. I have merely taken the opportunity to point out that the United States Treasury will lose some \$187 million in revenues from the Hoover Dam if this project is built. I have not opposed it because it will cost some \$2 million more a year in power costs to southern California power users. That amounts to about \$2 a family, and we can afford it. That argument is specious.

I have argued that the quality and quantity of the water that California gets will be interrupted, interfered with, and deteriorated because the overall project will store 48 million acre-feet of water, 48 million acre-feet of water that will never pass through Lee Ferry to go to southern California to serve that area, and another 10 million acre-feet that will disappear by means of evaporation. Water is one of our most precious commodities; we cannot afford such waste.

The Bureau has stated to the committee in this connection that the upper-basin States can store water for the purpose of using it 50 years hence and keep it from those who want to use it now in the lower basin, that such is a proper interpretation of the compact. That is an interpretation of the compact which is entirely strained and erroneous.

Whether you believe my statement is true or false as to the deterioration of California's water in quality and quantity, I want you to evaluate this on the statement made by Gov. Ed C. Johnson, who probably knows more about the Colorado project than any other individual. He served in the other body for a number of years and is presently the Governor of the State of Colorado. I refer to his statement issued in December 1954 in which Governor Johnson, among other things, quoted ex-President Hoover, who was the man at the head of the Colorado River Compact Commission back in 1922. He quoted Mr. Hoover to the following effect: "The lower basin will receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper basin for agricultural purposes."

Governor Johnson further stated:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin and must be delivered to the lower basin.

There are serious misconceptions abroad concerning the terms of the Colorado River compact, according to Governor Johnson.

He says it imposes restriction on the upper basin which must be understood, as they are basic to any plan of development in the upper basin.

These basic questions are, according to Johnson:

First. Does the compact deny the upper basin the right to withhold water it cannot use for domestic and agricultural purposes?

Second. Does it deny the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power?

The answers he gives are these:

Article II (h) of the compact defines "domestic use" as for household, stock, municipal, mining and milling, industrial, and like purposes, excluding power generation.

Article III (e) says the upper-basin States shall not withhold water and the lower-basin States shall not require delivery of water which cannot reasonably be applied for domestic and agricultural uses.

Herbert Hoover was chairman of the Commission that drafted and signed the compact. He interpreted these provisions at the request of Representative Hayden, of Arizona, on January 27, 1923, before any State ratified the compact.

Asked if article III (d) meant that upper basin could withhold all except 75 million acre-feet within consecutive 10-year periods and thus secure not only III (a) water but the entire unapportioned surplus, Hoover replied:

No. Article III (a) gives the upper basin 7.5 million acre-feet per annum. III (e) says the upper-basin States cannot withhold water that cannot be beneficially used. III (f) and III (g) specifically leave to further apportionment water now unapportioned. So there is no possibility of construing III (d) as suggested.

According to Governor Johnson, when asked why article IV (b) made impounding of water for power purposes subservient to its use and consumption for agricultural and domestic purposes, Hoover said:

(a) Because that conforms to established law in most semi-arid States.

(b) Because cultivation of land outranks in importance generation of power.

(c) Because there was a general agreement by all parties appearing before the commission that such preference was proper.

Asked if such subordination of hydroelectric power to domestic and agricultural uses would destroy Arizona's claimed ability to develop 3 million horsepower if the river continued to flow undiminished into Arizona, Hoover answered, according to Governor Johnson's statement:

Since the compact states that no water is to be withheld above that cannot be used for agriculture, the lower basin will thus receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper basin for agricultural purposes.

Governor Johnson then quoted Delph E. Carpenter, Colorado's compact commissioner who reported to the Governor of Colorado on December 15, 1922:

Power claims will always be limited by the quantity of water necessary for domestic and agricultural purposes * * * power is * * * subservient to the preferred and dominant uses and shall not interfere with junior preferred uses in either basin.

On March 20, 1923, Carpenter, in a letter to a Colorado Senator and Congressman, reiterated:

All power uses in both basins are made subservient to * * * agriculture and domestic * * * and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

Further explaining the point, Governor Johnson said that an interpretation of the compact published January 15, 1923, W. S. Norviel, Arizona's commission said:

The fifth principle (established by the compact, is that the upper States shall not withhold water that cannot be reasonably applied for agricultural uses.

In response to written questions, Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, on January 20, 1923, elicited the following statement from A. P. Davis, then Director of the United States Reclamation Service, according to Colorado's governor:

The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7.5 million acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all the yield of the lower basin, and that water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below.

I quote Governor Johnson directly as follows:

The foregoing official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified and were not disputed. Most certainly we are bound hand and foot by them.

Johnson added that the compact foresaw a subsequent treaty with Mexico as to that country's right to Colorado River water and spelled out just how that burden should fall on the upper and lower basins. Article III (c) provided that it was to come out of surplus to the extent possible, and the balance of the burden would be shared equally by each basin.

Then Governor Johnson made this admission:

If the upper basin States build storage reservoirs at the Glen Canyon and Echo Park sites as is now contemplated, the water withheld thereby will, of necessity, be surplus water since the upper States cannot use it for agricultural or domestic purposes, and the upper States, therefore, must deliver such water to Mexico as is allocated to her under the provision of the Seven State Compact.

Senator HAYDEN's question No. 15 to Hoover on this point brought the reply:

The upper States shall add their share of the Mexican burden to delivery to be made at Lee Ferry. Article III (c) requires that amount to be delivered in addition to the 75 million acre-feet otherwise provided for * * * the upper basin must furnish its half of any deficiency.

Carpenter's report to the then Governor of Colorado contained a similar statement.

Governor Johnson then adds, that if Carpenter had thought about it, he also would have said:

Water held in the upper basin to generate power and which for physical reasons could not be used by the upper basin for agricultural or domestic purposes is surplus water to the upper basin.

Governor Johnson clinches it with this statement:

Such an interpretation must be crystal clear to any student to the seven-State compact and the official interpretations of its provisions.

Then he goes on to summarize what the compact does as follows:

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned * * * the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7.5 million acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an additional 1 million acre-feet per annum of surplus water (art. III (b)). However, the 7.5 million acre-feet awarded the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7.5 million acre-feet awarded the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7.5 million acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

As to the article III (b) entitlement of lower-basin States to make beneficial use of an additional million acre-feet of water, Governor Johnson said this is to be met out of surplus water over and above article III (a) water, provided the upper States are using their 7.5 million acre-feet for agricultural and domestic purposes. Even if the upper basin stores for power, at least 1 million acre-feet per annum must go to satisfy this article III (b) demand.

HAYDEN questioned Hoover on this point, according to Governor Johnson, and he answered that the article III (b) water was not just to come out of tributary sources in Arizona, but was to come from the main river or from any of its tributaries.

So, Governor Johnson stated:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in Glen Canyon and Echo Park reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1.5 million acre-feet to Mexico and the 1 million acre-feet (of article III (b) water) to the lower basin; further, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Governor Johnson adds, the upper States must deliver 75 million acre-feet during each 10-year period plus 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico, total 82½ million acre-feet, before they can use any water beyond that used before the compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that would leave 3¼ million acre-feet. In the previous 10-year period it would have been 4,150,000 acre-feet. In 1902 upper basin would not have had anything under this formula.

Eight hundred eighty thousand acre-feet would be lost per year in evaporation. Colorado would be charged with 400,000 acre-feet of that loss, yet would not get one drop of water out of the storage dams. Colorado is too close to the bottom of the water barrel and cannot afford that loss, so must insist

on storage projects in Colorado, according to Johnson.

The Hill report, bought and paid for by the State of Colorado, indicated about 1 million acre-feet of unappropriated water in Colorado. But it did not charge Colorado with the Mexican burden of at least 375,000 acre-feet which will jump to 750,000 acre-feet if the dams are built for storage. This plus evaporation would leave the State without any unappropriated water at all.

In connection with the statement true or false as to the reduction in California's rightful share of water, I quote the Attorney General of the State of California, Mr. Pat Brown, who states I am correct.

The following article appeared in the Los Angeles Times under date of February 24, 1956:

UPPER COLORADO BILL'S DEFEAT URGED BY BROWN—ATTORNEY GENERAL CALLS PROJECT UNNEEDED AND THREAT TO CALIFORNIA'S WATER RIGHTS

California's Democratic attorney general spoke out decisively yesterday against the billion-dollar upper Colorado River project bill now nearing a vote in the House in Washington.

The long struggle over the controversial measure has been moving toward a climax.

Attorney General Brown's statement summed up the California position and explained the opposition of this State to the measure.

"In the interest of sound reclamation and sound national economy, the upper Colorado River project bill ought to be decisively defeated," Brown said. "I understand that it is scheduled to come up for a vote in the House of Representatives during the week of February 26."

ADVERSE TO STATE

"I am convinced that the upper Colorado River project bill as it is being presented to Congress will adversely affect California's vitally important water rights on the Colorado River.

"The office of the attorney general now is engaged in defending California's water rights on the Colorado River in a suit pending before the Supreme Court. With this suit in progress, certainly every other precaution also must be taken to protect California's rights on the Colorado River from harmful legislative measures. I believe the upper Colorado River project bill constitutes such a threat."

OTHER BASIC REASONS

"There are other basic reasons why the bill should not be adopted. Certainly it is inconsistent for our good neighbors in the upper Colorado River Basin to press for a bill that would bring hundreds of thousands of acres of new land into crop production at a time when Congress is faced with the plan to pay farmers billions of dollars to withdraw some 40 million acres of farmland from crop production.

"I am convinced that there is no justification for the passage of the upper Colorado project bill, at this session of Congress."

Now, if that is not enough, I want to tell you this statement that Governor Johnson made in connection with the Colorado River controversy I just quoted is based on the report of Raymond C. Hill and Associates, an engineering firm who was sufficiently able to be hired and paid for by the State of Colorado to report on their water resources. This very serious statement made by Governor Johnson I have mentioned is based on that report.

Mr. Hill was also employed by the San Diego County Water Authority to make

a survey of its water resources. The San Diego County Water Authority is one of some 67 southern California agencies, cities, towns, and groups that are in the metropolitan water district that vitally depend upon the Colorado River for its water supply. This is what Mr. Hill told the San Diego County Water Authority:

When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the MWD (metropolitan water district), namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right. * * *

Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, what affects one member of the Metropolitan Water District disastrously affects all members disastrously. All 67 cities and authorities in southern California would be so affected—6 million people, a tremendous part of the economy of our country.

If I did less than to use every best effort that I have to oppose this project on the basis that I have just read to you, I would do that much less than my oath of office and my duty to the people of southern California would require.

I set forth California's reasons for opposing the upper Colorado project in a speech found at page 9850 of the 1955 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During 1956, in this RECORD, at pages A1753 and A1757, I made remarks entitled, respectively, "State of California Officially Opposes Upper Colorado—A Resolution of the State Legislature"—and "California's Opposition Based on Protection of Her Water Rights."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is not speaking on his question of personal privilege, but is speaking as to the nature of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has previously stated that in laying the foundation for answering the charge of falsehood in the editorial, the

gentleman from California would have rather a broad field to discuss his reasons for defending himself. The Chair calls attention to the gentleman from California, that there are limits to the liberality extended in this connection and suggests that the gentleman from California proceed in order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand this editorial is several weeks or months old. Does the age of the editorial make any difference with the Chair in that it should have been answered more promptly and that the gentleman should have been more resourceful than to use this particular time in dealing with the editorial?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that that question has no purpose at all in the present problem. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said that the \$1.5 billion upper Colorado River storage project as approved by the Senate and an ostensibly similar House bill are one and the same thing. True or false?

In actuality, the project is the non-divisible \$1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole project as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it appear palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

The bill as reported out by the committee is S. 500 with all after the enacting clause stricken and the body of H. R. 3383, as amended by the committee, substituted. We thus have two versions of S. 500. The projects they provide for are as follows as can be seen from the chart I have here:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383 (substitute)
Power and storage dams.....	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo, Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pino River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navajo.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized). By Senate, 21. By House, 24.		Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket.

From the foregoing tabulation it may be seen that as to projects the only difference between the bills is this: the Sen-

ate authorizes the Echo Park and Juniper Dams now, as well as Gooseberry project, while the House version neglects to men-

tion Echo Park and Juniper although it conditionally authorizes Gooseberry, substitutes San Miguel for Woody Creek, and adds Animas LaPlata and Yellow Jacket.

Although the bills differ in detail, they are essentially the same in objective, and in projects contemplated for development of water and power in the upper Colorado River Basin. Both bills must be considered together and treated as one bill. Should the House pass the measure before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to discuss would be the treatment of these small differences about which projects to authorize now and which to come back for later.

Should the House act favorably on the pending bill, it is likely that the project authorizations and other provisions of the Senate bill will be added to the House bill in conference.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For the last 5 minutes the gentleman has made no reference to the truth or falsity of the charge that he raised under his question of personal privilege. On the contrary, he has placed before the Members of the House a chart, and from that he now proceeds to discuss the bill. It has no relation to the truth or falsity of the charge. The gentleman has refused to permit anyone to ask him any questions and proceeds to discuss this bill, so that it does not come within the definition of personal privilege, on which grounds he sought the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair might state that he feels that the gentleman from California is very close to the line where the Chair may sustain a point of order. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman has the right to discuss the facts involved in the pending bill insofar as that is necessary in order for the gentleman to express his views with reference to the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial, and to answer that charge, and make his record in that respect. The Chair again suggests to the gentleman from California, having in mind the observations of the Chair, particularly those just made, that he proceed in order and confine his discussion of the bill at this time only to that which is necessary to challenge the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am in a difficult position, because the editorial states merely that, "He would dream up a bigger falsehood than those he has already presented," and I can only say what I have said about the bill for the purpose of challenging that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not stopped the gentleman to date but has suggested to the gentleman that he is getting very close to the borderline where the Chair reluctantly may be constrained to sustain a point of order. I might say the Chair has been very liberal and hopes that the gentleman from California will not present arguments on the merits of the bill

which are not related to meeting the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial, to a point where the Chair will feel constrained to sustain a point of order.

The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I proceed now to the point whether it is true or false, the statement that I have made that these various versions of the bill are one and the same thing, that it is actually a \$1½ billion entity. I have shown you the various participating projects, and have explained to you the very minute difference in the authorizations sought in similar projects.

I now want to explain my allegation is supported by statements contained in the majority report. If the Members will turn to the report, they will find on page 6 the statement:

The legislation recognizes that the units and projects authorized and the additional projects named for planning constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive plan for development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin and that the legislation is not intended to limit or preclude, in the future, as additional needs are indicated, authorization by the Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned to the upper basin States under the Colorado River compact.

That is why I say that this is just the initial foot in the door, camel's nose under the tent, that we are dealing with a \$1½ billion entity here labeled as the upper Colorado River storage project; and that once we mire ourselves down in the beginning of it, there will be no end to expenditures that will have to be made.

I have said that the ultimate cost of this piece of legislation before the House will be \$5 billion. Why have I said that? Is it true or is it false?

In order to answer that question and in order for you to evaluate the accuracy of it, I must say this: In connection with reclamation projects in general, the portion of the funds that goes to construct the irrigation phase, as distinguished from the power phases of the project, are reimbursable to the United States Government, but reimbursable without interest.

Therefore, there is a burden upon the taxpayers of the United States of the interest that accumulates on the money that the Federal Treasury borrows and has to continue borrowing during the

whole period that a project pays out. That bears directly on whether or not this is a \$5 billion entity or not.

Just take the projects alone that are in our bill, or take the Senate bill, which is practically the same, insofar as those projects on which this type of nonreimbursable interest would accumulate are concerned, not for 10 years, not for 20 years, not for 30, not for 40, but for 70, 80, or up to 100 years, we do not know, at 2½ percent for 10 years you accumulate an interest charge of a quarter of the principal amount borrowed. In 40 years you have accumulated an amount equal to 100 percent. In 80 years you have accumulated an amount equal to 200 percent of the original investment, and that is the reason why this type of legislation involves the taxpayers of the United States in such tremendous costs.

Just on those projects that we have in the bill, and although they are listed at \$760 million in the authorization, the Bureau of Reclamation has told us they will cost \$933 million, on the projects alone substantially, according to the calculations on the paybacks and the time they will take, and, parenthetically, you notice that portions of the bill talk about up to 100 years and other portions talk about up to 50 years, to pay back the accumulated interest would be \$1,428 million, on a probable direct project cost, of more like \$1,093 million: that would make its total cost \$2,521 million. Give or take half a billion on that to accommodate it to the \$933 million price tag on this bill and you still have a \$2 billion project.

That is why I say that this initial phase is so extensive. If you do the same type of calculation for those projects which are listed for study and later authorization, you will find that the bill adds up to \$5 billion. You get back your original investment in power, you get back your original investment in irrigation, if the thing pays out, but you are still out those tremendous sums in the payment of interest. Proponents will be coming back in later years to get the additional projects listed for study by the bill. That is why I say this will end up as a \$5 billion project. I refer you to the following chart prepared at a time when the projects in the bill totaled \$1,093 million, as illustrative of the hidden interest burden, together with how it is distributed among the States:

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama.....	0.93	\$10,164,900	\$13,280,400	\$15,354,300	\$31,889,700
Arizona.....	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas.....	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California.....	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado.....	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut.....	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware.....	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida.....	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia.....	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho.....	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois.....	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana.....	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa.....	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas.....	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky.....	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana.....	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Maine.....	0.38	\$4,153,400	\$5,426,400	\$6,273,800	\$13,030,200
Maryland.....	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts.....	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan.....	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota.....	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi.....	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri.....	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana.....	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska.....	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada.....	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire.....	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey.....	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico.....	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York.....	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina.....	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota.....	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio.....	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,000	219,113,100
Oklahoma.....	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon.....	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania.....	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	255,203,700
Rhode Island.....	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina.....	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota.....	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee.....	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas.....	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah.....	.31	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont.....	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
Virginia.....	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington.....	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia.....	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin.....	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming.....	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total.....	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000
			2,521,000,000		5,080,000,000

More than that, the secondary phases of the central Utah project, and only the initial phases are provided for here, are such that in the Rules Committee one of the project's opponents admitted that the direct cost of that without interest would probably be in excess of \$3 billion.

If you think that this is a falsehood with respect to the interest and its accumulated cost, the compound interest on the money that is borrowed, just let me quote to you from a letter dated March 17, 1955, to the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the other body from the Department of the Interior, signed by a man named Crosthwait, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in which he said that the project recommended by the Secretary would involve a total interest cost of \$1,153,000,000. That is a lot of money, and that is why I make these charges. Here is the pertinent paragraph of the letter:

The project recommended by the Secretary would involve an interest cost to the Federal Government discounted to year 1957 of about \$175 million based on the allocation to power being repaid in year 2002 and \$190 million based on the final payment from the irrigation water users in year 2032. Studies show (1) that compound interest at 2.5 percent on the construction costs would be in the magnitude of \$550 million which amount less credits of \$15 million for interest on payments by the irrigation users would result in an interest cost in the order of \$535 million, and (2) that the interest cost incurred through year 2032 and interest from year 2003 to year 2032 on the remaining balance would amount to about \$1,200,000,000 which, less credits of \$47 million for interest on payments of the water users, would result in a total interest cost of \$1,153,000,000 in year 2032.

So that there may be no question as to how I arrived at the \$933 million di-

rect cost of the project referred to a few moments ago, let me put it this way.

Section 12 of the bill reported by the committee contains an appropriation authorization of "such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act but not to exceed \$760 million." This implies that such sum is sufficient to construct the projects authorized by the act. In fact, according to the Reclamation Bureau figures contained in the hearings, an additional \$173,468,300 would be required to construct the authorized features, bringing the total sum to \$933,468,000.

In view of the notoriously inadequate estimates made in the past by the Bureau, it is a very good possibility that ultimate costs for these features alone will be well over \$1 billion.

In any event it should be thoroughly understood that the figure used in the bill will not, according to Bureau estimates, construct this project. Instead of \$760 million the actual figure is \$933 million, or, if a lower Curecanti should be constructed (either is authorized by the bill) the cost would be \$894 million. Here are the figures taken from those supplied by the Bureau at pages 64-67 of the hearings. The projects here accounted for are only those named as authorized in section 1 of the bill:

11 participating projects.....	\$304,356,300
Glen Canyon Dam.....	421,270,000
Flaming Gorge.....	82,942,000
Navaho (dam and reservoir only).....	49,305,000
Curecanti (940,000 acre-feet).....	49,305,000
	<u>\$894,273,300</u>
Curecanti (modified plan).....	88,500,000
	<u>933,468,300</u>

Actually, the project development sought to be authorized by the bill is just the starter for some 34 or more storage and reclamation projects specifically named, contemplated, and designated in House Document 364 as the upper Colorado River storage project, involving a construction cost of \$1.6 billion at least, or over twice the amount of the appropriation set forth in the House bill. The figure of \$760 million in the House bill is an attempt to hide from Congress the true cost of the development.

I have mentioned before that the \$760 million appropriation figure in the bill should not mislead you when it comes to determining whether or not what I say about the cost of this bill is true.

Now that cost even at that is probably a very low one because I have taken the precaution, as I have in all my statements, to have the documentation necessary to back them up. I obtained from the second Hoover Commission a full list of the projects that have been carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation—what the Congress brought the hammer down on them for—what the Bureau of Reclamation told the Congress they would cost—and what the Congress actually ended up appropriating for them. It is a long list but you may be interested in just a few excerpts. One Colorado project was sold to the Congress for \$1,300,000 and ended up costing \$8.9 million.

A New Mexico project was supposed to cost \$2.3 million and Congress ended up appropriating \$27 million. These are direct construction costs.

A Wyoming project was supposed to cost \$9.4 million and the Congress ended up appropriating \$26.6 million.

A Utah project started out at \$9.9 million and ended up costing the taxpayers \$33.4 million.

Here is the complete chart:

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Hondo, N. Mex.....	1903	\$359,000	\$371,788
Milk River, Mont.....	1903	1,000,000	9,881,774
Newlands, Nev.....	1903	1,250,000	7,899,479
North Platte, Nebr.....	1903	2,516,000	27,939,501
Salt River, Ariz.....	1903	2,800,000	26,244,688
Uncompahgre, Colo.....	1903	1,300,000	8,965,959
Bell Fourche, S. Dak.....	1904	2,100,000	5,288,236
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak. (old).....	1904	(?)	223,423
Lower Yellowstone, Mont.-N. Dak.....	1904	1,200,000	3,633,219
Minidoka, Idaho-Wyo.....	1904	2,600,000	43,706,054
Shoshone, Wyo.-Mont.....	1904	7,828,000	23,673,962
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif.....	1904	3,000,000	5,806,743
Boise, Idaho.....	1905	10,852,000	66,371,938
Carlsbad, N. Mex.....	1905	605,000	5,800,683
Garden City, Kans.....	1905	149,000	334,475
Huntley, Mont.....	1905	900,000	1,552,159
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.....	1905	4,470,000	18,871,222
Okanogan, Wash.....	1905	444,000	1,633,973
Rio Grande, N. Mex.-Tex.....	1905	2,317,113	27,337,078
Strawberry Valley, Utah.....	1905	1,250,000	3,498,994
Umatilla, Oreg.....	1905	1,000,000	5,324,457
Yakima, Wash.....	1905	10,000,000	60,359,928
Sun River, Mont.....	1906	7,372,000	10,059,013
Williston, N. Dak.....	1906	(2)	409,095
Orland, Calif.....	1907	1,607,000	2,564,519
Grand Valley, Colo.....	1911	3,621,663	6,765,733
King Hill, Idaho.....	1917	527,230	1,987,854
Yuma auxiliary, Arizona.....	1917	(3)	2,266,487
Riverton, Wyo.....	1920	9,465,000	26,626,000
Owyhee, Oreg.-Idaho.....	1926	17,715,000	18,998,744
Vale, Oreg.....	1926	3,590,000	4,962,697
Weber River, Utah.....	1927	3,000,000	2,725,885
All American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.....	1928	38,500,000	67,614,755
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev. (Hoover Dam and powerplant).....	1928	126,500,000	172,070,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Bitter Root, Mont.	1930	\$750,000	\$1,037,087
Baker, Oreg.	1931	200,000	281,589
Burnt River, Oreg.	1935	550,000	601,026
Central Valley, Calif.	1935	170,000,000	737,774,000
Colorado Basin, Wash.	1935	487,030,228	754,476,000
Frenchtown, Mont.	1935	220,000	290,797
Humboldt, Nev.	1935	2,000,000	1,214,321
Hyrum, Utah	1935	930,000	953,854
Kendrick, Wyo.	1935	20,004,000	37,738,385
Moon Lake, Utah	1935	1,500,000	1,599,359
Ogden River, Utah	1935	3,500,000	4,735,284
Parker Dam, Ariz.-Calif. (power)	1935	21,767,000	24,201,803
Provo River, Utah	1935	9,974,000	33,452,199
Sanpete, Utah	1935	375,000	374,540
Truckee storage, Nevada-California	1935	1,000,000	1,092,423
Buffalo Rapids, Mont.	1937	3,055,000	5,669,336
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo.	1937	31,702,772	164,131,000
Colorado River, Tex.	1937	20,000,000	23,961,794
Deschutes, Oreg.	1937	8,000,000	12,943,000
Gila, Ariz.	1937	19,474,000	450,083,860
Pine River, Colo.	1937	3,240,000	3,471,437
Tuacumcari, N. Mex.	1937	8,278,000	15,540,011
Austin, W. C., Okla.	1938	5,600,000	12,295,102
Fort Peck, Mont.-N. Dak., (exclusive of powerplant and dam)	1938	200,000	25,400,000
Fruitgrowers Dam, Colo.	1938	200,000	200,309
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak., (WCU)	1939	1,500,000	1,238,546
Paoai, Colo.	1939	3,030,000	6,723,308
Rapid Valley, S. Dak.	1939	1,118,000	927,412
Colorado River, Ariz.-Calif.-Nev. (front work-levees)	1940	(¹)	12,190,000
Eden, Wyo.	1940	2,445,000	6,152,000
Mancos, Colo.	1940	1,475,000	3,926,000
Mirage Flats, Nebr.	1940	2,560,000	3,282,588
Newton, Utah	1940	595,000	712,591
San Luis Valley, Colo. (1st unit)	1940	17,465,000	56,230,577
Davis Dam, Nev.-Ariz.-Calif.	1941	41,200,000	118,002,056
Palladas, Idaho-Wyo.	1941	24,092,000	76,601,000
Seofield, Utah	1943	640,000	943,889
Balmorhea, Tex.	1944	347,000	429,554
Hungry Horse, Mont. (power)	1944	48,319,000	102,900,000
Intake, Mont.	1944	62,000	90,530
Missoula Valley, Mont.	1944	250,000	278,762
Rathdrum Prairie, Idaho	1944	300,000	482,360
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	1946	1,466,000	2,488,000
Arnold Oreg.	1947	220,000	205,535
Caehuma, Calif.	1948	32,310,000	36,967,000
Ochoo, Oreg.	1948	1,500,000	849,830
Preston Bench, Idaho	1948	453,000	449,554
Solano, Calif.	1948	45,577,000	47,111,000
Fort Sumner, N. Mex.	1949	1,798,000	2,434,257
Grants Pass, Oreg.	1949	100,000	100,000
Weber Basin, Utah	1949	69,534,000	70,385,000
Canadian River, Tex.	1950		96,079,100
Eklutna, Alaska	1950	20,365,400	33,800,000
Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex.	1950	30,179,000	29,606,000
Vermejo, N. Mex.	1950	2,679,000	2,919,000
Collbran, Colo.	1952		17,236,000

¹ Estimated in H. Doc. 1262, 61st Cong., 3d sess., Fund for Reclamation of Arid Lands 1911.

² Combined cost of Williston and Buford-Trenton estimated in 1911 at \$1,195,000.

³ Included in estimate of Yuma project.

⁴ Exclusive of contemplated allocation of \$1,553,565 of cost of Imperial Dam herein included in All American Canal project.

⁵ Exclusive of cost of storage works (Conechas Dam) constructed by Corps of Engineers.

⁶ \$100,000 per year.

As I have indicated on the hidden interest chart I referred to previously, if you total these direct costs and extremely extravagant hidden interest costs and apply the percentages that each of the various States of the Union contribute in taxes to support the Federal Government, you can find out how much your own State would pay.

It is true, I have said, that while this river is running through four States, it will drain 44 States, and from these charts I think you can see well why; and well see why I have consistently termed this piece of legislation the solid gold reclamation project; and have asked would it not be just as sensible for the Congress to appropriate money to grow

bananas on Pike's Peak as it would be to appropriate money for the upper Colorado project?

It is because I believe that this project is not sound that I am opposing it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the first point of order is that the gentleman is not permitted under the rules to refer to something said by a Member of the other body in that body, and secondly, that the gentleman from California is not referring to the truth or untruth of the allegations in the editorial when he is quoting some person such as a Member of the other body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York sounds correct. Reference cannot be made to what has taken place in the other body. The gentleman from California made such reference previously, but no point of order was made. The Chair has been very liberal in permitting the gentleman from California to retain the floor because if the Chair sustains the point of order, the gentleman would lose the floor and the Chair hesitates to go that far with reference to any Member of the House who has the floor on a point of personal privilege. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from California cooperate with the Chair in trying to enable the gentleman from California to retain the floor for the remainder of his time. The gentleman from California may proceed in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have another point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chair having sustained the point of order, which has just been made, must now declare the gentleman from California has lost the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that what the gentleman said in raising the point of order was sound, but that the Chair has not yet passed on that point of order, and has recognized the gentleman from California to proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly attempt to proceed in order and will expunge the remarks with reference to a Member of the other body from the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that the project is not self-liquidating—true or false? Start with the \$933 million which the Bureau states it will cost.

The Bureau presents this as being a self-liquidating project. Plain arithmetic shows that it would not be. Simple interest alone, even at 2½ percent on \$993 million of original investment for the smaller project proposed is \$23,325,000 per year; for the larger \$1.6 billion development proposed is \$40 million per year. Total net revenues, as estimated by the Bureau for the smaller or larger developments, would average less than these amounts. At page 12 of its report the Interior committee estimates for the first 50 years of the project, power revenues of \$1,075,000,000 and water rev-

enues of \$36,600,000. Total \$1,111,600,000, or revenues of \$22,230,000 a year on the average. Obviously this is a smaller sum than the \$23,325,000 annual interest. Equally obvious is that the project is bankrupt before it even starts.

As the project could not pay simple interest on the investments, its revenues could never retire the capital cost. The Nation's taxpayers would have to do that. Or if revenues were earmarked to retire the capital, the taxpayers would have to pay about all of the interest. In any event, the net burden on the taxpayers would be more than \$1 billion for the smaller development and \$4 billion for the larger development, by the end of the proposed repayment period. The accumulated debt would keep on increasing until paid off by general taxation since it could never be repaid from project revenues.

These figures I think show us that the project is obviously not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Now, I next have said that the financial scheme is unsound and will burden the taxpayers for generations and generations to come. Is this true or false?

I have made certain charges underlying and supporting this. I want you to determine whether they are true or false. I have said the irrigation projects are financially infeasible, requiring an average subsidy of 85 percent of the cost. True or false? Here are the facts:

None of the reclamation components of the project would be financially sound themselves. The original direct irrigation investments on the 11 projects recommended by the Secretary range from \$200 to nearly \$800 per acre for the central Utah project—initial phase. For the Navaho project authorized by the Senate-approved bill, the original investment would be over \$1,500 per acre. Including the cost of the storage units allocated to irrigation, the average direct investment—construction cost—disregarding hidden interest, would be \$750 to \$900 per acre, varying with the number of projects included.

As compared to these costs, the average value of already irrigated farmlands in the project area is about \$150 per acre. Thus, the average investment proposed by the project would be 5 to 6 times the average value of the land after irrigation.

Of the total irrigation investment, the irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay about 15 percent. Consequently, these irrigation projects must be subsidized to the extent of about 85 percent either by power revenues or directly from the Federal Treasury by such devices as allocations for assumed flood-control benefits, fish and wildlife benefits, and so forth.

I have said project repayment provisions are unrealistic and economically indefensible. True or false? Here are the facts: The proposed repayment plan for the project would be to pay off the entire irrigation investment in 50 years by applying all power and irrigation revenues toward that end. Thereafter, the huge power investment would be paid off in not to exceed 100 years.

The record reveals that such a plan might work in the case of a development comprising the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and the 11 participating reclamation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but would fail with additional projects added.

At the House hearings, a Bureau witness, E. O. Larson, stated, page 215, House hearings on H. R. 3383:

With 11 participating projects paid out concurrently, you could do that and pay off power in less than 100 years. But 1 disadvantage of that plan is that you cannot take on more than the 11 projects without raising the power rate, if additional projects are developed while the power is taking 100 years to pay out, the higher you have to raise the power rates.

Studies indicate that the minimum number of projects specified for authorization in the House bill might pay out under the repayment provisions of the bill, and that it would take 90 to 95 years to repay the power investment with power sold at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. But with additional projects added, either storage units or irrigation projects, either the power rate would have to be materially increased to get within the 100-year payment period for power, or the period of repayment would be far greater than 100 years.

The \$1.6 billion overall project would have no possibility of payout with 6-mill power under the repayment provisions of the House bill. In fact, it could never pay out under such a financial program.

Moreover, to predicate a repayment plan on continuing revenues from hydroelectric power development for 100 years in the future is unrealistic and unsound, in view of possible changes in economic conditions, obsolescence and competing sources of power, including atomic energy.

I have said the project's financial scheme is based on the impossible assumption that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years.

If my statement is to be determined true or false, we will have to see what the prospects for the power revenues are. Every single estimate and calculation that has been made as to paying off this project from power have been based on selling 6-mill power for the next 100 years. Here are the facts:

Six mills or more, the price to be charged for power generated by the hydroelectric plants in this project, is an extremely high rate for public power. There is no guaranty that the power can be sold at that rate. The bill does not require that contracts for the sale of the power be negotiated before construction begins, such as was required under the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized Hoover Dam.

It is especially doubtful that a market for 6-mill power will continue for 100 years—a full century—as contemplated by the bill. These power units will be located in a region having boundless energy potential in the greatest coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits in the country. These resources, combined with the approaching availability of atomic electric power, will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete in the near future, and the project will not be able to repay

the Federal Treasury as scheduled, or, perhaps, at all.

We are being asked to look 100 years into the future by this newspaper that accuses me of falsehood. To consider the future, let us look back 100 years. The Civil War had not even been fought; Thomas Alva Edison was 9 years old; and electricity had not even come into use for any purpose other than an occasional bolt of lightning.

One hundred years in the future is a tremendous interval, especially in the light of present atomic development. Can you imagine how it will develop? Can you compare hydroelectric power with atomic generated power? Is it feasible to expect these revenues to come in to make the project feasible and pay out having to sell hydropower against atomic-developed power during the next 100 years? That is why I ask you to evaluate my statement as to the project's scheme of financing being wholly unsound.

Let us get into these nuclear developments. Today Congress has seriously before it a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and others, to provide actual atomic heating and lighting of the Capitol of the United States. The Shoreham Hotel downtown is determining whether or not it will install an atomic plant. So you see these developments are not speculative, they are not 100 years ahead of us, they are here today. When these installations have been made what is to become of them? Hydroelectric power can in no way be modernized and be made competitive as these developments unfold.

This project is not financially sound. If you took out the hydro part and put in nuclear power, yes, it could be modernized and made competitive, but you cannot make hydropower competitive with atomic power. That is why I say the project's financial scheme is not feasible or workable. That is why I made the following statement on the subject on March 6, 1955:

The age of nuclear power has arrived and electric power companies are now building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.

What does this mean to conscientious legislators who must evaluate proposals to invest large sums of money in new Federal hydroelectric projects?

Simply that they must look at them, not only in the light of all factors heretofore considered, but with this additional question in mind: Will nuclear power be transformed into electric energy at cheaper rates than electric energy can be obtained from water power in the foreseeable future?

If the answer is "Yes," then our vast hydroelectric plants may become obsolete white elephants, giving way to more efficient nuclear-electric plants just as the horse and buggy gave way to the more efficient automobile. If this should happen, the Federal Treasury would never recover the millions it might pour into hydroelectric and related developments.

With millions, and possibly billions at stake, consideration of this possibility is absolutely essential if Congress is to act with responsibility in this day of swiftly moving scientific progress.

The proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado storage project is a specific instance.

Bills now before the Congress call for a spending authorization ranging from \$1 billion to \$1.8 billion on the Upper Colorado River. They would construct numerous irrigation projects, the revenues from which could repay only 7 percent of their cost. Tied in with the bills are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations, but also 93 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power "cash register."

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced, much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Remember, just 15 years ago, in 1940 nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commercial nuclear-electric energy generating plants are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic power stations at an estimated cost of \$840,000,000. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present conventional generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of \$100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1 or 2 mill current instead of 6.7 mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its fuel value of about \$20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

That is why Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, vice chairman of the Joint House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee, just a few days ago predicted that atomic experts will develop a reactor in the next 2 years that will produce power as cheaply as oil, coal, or water.

Within 5 years, he said, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course are the hydroelectric plants.

During a speech in Los Angeles on February 15, Floyd B. Odium, financier and president of Atlas Corp., predicted that by 1975 all electricity in the United States will be generated by uranium-based powerplants. He, too, said that even at present atomic energy is practically competitive with other fuels for the generation of electric power.

Using a cubic-inch block of wood as a symbol representing a similar block of uranium-235, Odium said that 20 such little blocks of U-235 would supply enough energy to provide New York City with all its electrical needs for a 24-hour period.

Of course, there are numerous technical difficulties yet to be overcome in the production of nuclear electricity. But the fact is they are being overcome and sometimes in the very process of building nuclear-electric facilities.

Consolidated Edison of New York, one of the Nation's leading power producers, boldly announced only a month ago that it will soon build a nuclear-electric generating plant to add to its system.

Thus the problem is facing us squarely, and we cannot dodge it in connection with the upper Colorado proposal. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Congress must have their eyes open to these facts of modern-day life. There must be a clear-cut determination as to whether or not nuclear-electric energy developments will turn this proposed multibillion dollar expenditure into a dead loss. We cannot inflict such an enormous new burden on the Nation's taxpayers for several generations to come.

Therefore, Congress must hold thorough hearings on this point. It must even delay consideration of the legislation for a year or two, if need be, so that the legislation may be evaluated in the light of results of nuclear-electric energy research and development now under way.

So that the Congress may be further informed I am backing up this plea with additional information I have collected over the past few weeks.

That is why I made another statement on this subject on February 21, 1956, as follows:

Production of electric power by atomic energy is not a dream of the future. The age of nuclear power is here.

Today the United States is engaged in a vital contest with the Soviets to maintain its nuclear leadership not only in weapons, but equally in economic uses of the atom's secrets. If we fail in this, then we will fail to stem the tide of ruthless, aggressive, dictatorial communism. Such a failure would not be America's alone, but would be shared by people everywhere who look to us to preserve the peace and maintain the freedom and dignity of mankind.

Yet in the midst of this deadly struggle, Congress is being asked to waste hundreds of millions of dollars worth of our resources to build hydroelectric plants as "cash registers" for irrigating arid land at high altitudes in Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. This is a project so infeasible that its water revenues could repay less than 15 percent of its cost. It is a project that could only add to the Nation's bulging agricultural surpluses.

I refer, of course, to the "solid gold Cadillac," a multibillion dollar upper Colorado River storage boondoggle.

If political pressures are so great in an election year that Congress cannot resist this greatest hoax since P. T. Barnum invented the "egress," at least it should be carried off in a manner minimizing its drag on the Nation's vital strength in the great battle against the Communist evil.

If Congress should insist on spending billions of dollars to put arid new land under cultivation and at the same time enact a \$1 billion a year program to deposit 40 million acres of farm land in soil banks, then at least in the process it should provide something of national benefit to salve the welts on United States taxpayer's backs.

This can be done if Congress firmly and courageously yanks out of the bill every cent of the \$504,212,000 provided for "horse and buggy" hydroelectric plants and directs this amount of money be used to build nuclear-electric facilities.

Such a substitution has a greater value merely than giving the United States nuclear-electric program a half-billion-dollar shot in the arm to spur it toward supremacy over the Reds. The idea may well save from ruin the already shaky financial structure of the upper Colorado scheme. It is presently based on selling 6-mill power for the next hundred years. Obviously, 6-mill power will be rendered competitively obso-

lete in a fraction of that time by nuclear-electric developments. Starting out with nuclear power plants, they could from time to time be modernized and bring power production costs down. Starting out with hydro plants, nothing could be done to stop them from being turned into history's most monumental white elephants by swiftly unfolding technological developments.

In short, not only do common sense tactics vis-a-vis Soviet developments demand this nuclear for hydroelectric substitution, but dollars and horseshoe as well demands it.

This is particularly true because there is no need for water storage behind power dams to enable the upper basin to make the new uses of 600,000 acre-feet of water annually contemplated in the bill. Over a million acre-feet of new uses can be made without such storage. The unnecessary storage provided for hydroelectric uses would permit evaporation from extensive lakes surfaces of over 800,000 acre-feet of precious water annually—125 percent of the amount put to beneficial use.

In the water-short West this is an additional and compelling reason to pull out the hydro plants and put in nuclear ones.

There is no justification for building great hydroelectric dams when atomic power can be more effectively utilized.

I have also pointed to the infeasibility of the financial scheme of the project by bringing to the attention of the Members of this body another swift-moving development that has occurred within the past few months. That is exemplified by the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Weather. It is a report that shows rain making is here today and that at a cost of a million dollars a year these four States—Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico—can get more water than they need. Yet the financing of this scheme calls for no recognition of that, no competition with that kind of a financial threat to the finances of the United States Treasury. The following is the text of my recent statement on this subject:

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT—WEATHER CONTROL MAKES IT A WHITE ELEPHANT

There has been an important scientific development since the upper Colorado River project was conceived which makes such project, if possible, even less economic and more infeasible than ever before.

The development is weather modification or control, commonly known as rainmaking.

The President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control has just made its report to the President. Additional precipitation of water through cloud seeding and similar weather modification methods has been proven, and acceptable methods of measurement of the degree of success of obtaining precipitation over normal have been found.

The President's Advisory Committee has studied the possibilities of additional water for the Colorado River through weather-control operations in the upper Colorado watershed and has stated that if the precipitation can be brought to 20 percent above the normal—that is, what it would be for a given year without such weather control—the upper river basin runoff for dry years would be increased by approximately 3 million acre-feet; for normal years by approximately 4,500,000 acre-feet; and for wet years by approximately 5,700,000 acre-feet.

Dr. Irving Krick, meteorologist, of Denver, Colo., who has carried out many such weather modification projects including studies and test work in the upper Colorado watershed, states that a 20-percent increase in precipitation is an exceedingly conserva-

tive estimate and that the average increase of precipitation over normal in other projects has approximately 50 percent. If the 50-percent figure were used for the upper Colorado basin, the additional runoff in dry seasons would be about 7 million acre-feet and for normal seasons would be more than 11 million acre-feet.

The upper Colorado River project now before Congress creates no additional water. It merely impounds water that is in the river anyway. It actually causes the available water to be decreased because it is admitted even by the proponents of the project that close to 1 million acre-feet would be evaporated into the air annually from the proposed reservoirs.

The water that would be brought to the Colorado River by weather control—rain-making—in the upper Colorado River watershed is more than the needs of the upper basin area. It can be used on its way down to the main river from the snowpacks, rainfalls, and so forth, to give moisture to pasture lands. It can be impounded here and there near its sources in small reservoirs to take care of the needs of present or proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and then it can go down to the river for use below Lees Ferry.

The cost of such small impounding dams above various points of use would be small compared with the nearly \$1 billion for the project as proposed in the bill.

The cost of obtaining this added runoff would approximate—according to the President's Advisory Committee—less than 50 cents per acre-foot or about \$1 million per year. On Dr. Krick's estimate of a greater precipitation the annual cost per acre-foot would be much less than 50 cents.

This added water, as it passes into Lake Mead and through the Hoover power plant, would be worth at least 50 cents per acre-foot for electric generation alone. But it then goes down the river where it can be used by various irrigation districts and water districts such as the Imperial and Coachella irrigation districts and the Metropolitan and San Diego water districts. The water for these purposes is worth more than \$2 per acre-foot.

Thus, on a more than self-sustaining basis from the start and with an expenditure of approximately \$1 million per year, all the nonpower objectives of the upper Colorado River project are met without the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

Furthermore, this increased precipitation will cause the water as it reaches points of use in the lower Colorado areas to have less salt content, whereas the evaporation of 1 million cubic feet a year resulting from the carrying through of the upper Colorado River project would admittedly cause the salt content of the water to increase materially. The water already carries about a ton of salt per acre-foot of water. Any increase of this salt content would require more water by the irrigator for leeching purposes and if the salt content increases greatly it would render such irrigator's soil worthless for purposes for which now used.

Weather modification in the upper Colorado Basin, in view of the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, should be tested for a few years before commitment is made for a billion-dollar project. The billion-dollar project will merely impound water already in the river and destroy part of its usefulness through evaporation. Weather modification at almost insignificant expense—which will be self-sustaining from the start—will create additional available water through increased precipitation and increased runoff.

The potential deficit of water in the Colorado River Basin is indicated by the President's Advisory Committee to be 9 or 10 million acre-feet per year. This cannot be produced by the project covered by the bill because no water is created. It can be pro-

duced without such project by simple and inexpensive weather control by cloud seeding, and so forth.

Dr. Krick has indicated his willingness to undertake such weather modification at actual out-of-pocket cost estimated at not to exceed \$1 million per year and to take his fee for services on a contingent basis at the rate of a certain number of cents per acre-foot of water produced over normal for the year in question.

From the above it is clear, based on the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, that the Colorado River project cannot be justified from the standpoint of irrigation and domestic needs in either the upper or lower river basins.

Few who have considered in Congress the bill for the upper Colorado River project have known much about weather modification—rainmaking—and its possibilities in the upper Colorado basin. What has been accomplished in this new field has been known only by a few. But the recent findings of the President's Advisory Committee change all this.

The upper Colorado River project bill should be sent back to the Interior Committee and carefully restudied in the light of this new development. It points the way to greater benefits for the areas and populations involved at far less cost.

I have pointed out that the financial scheme of the project is unsound, and I ask you whether it is true or false when I also said that the very water rights upon which the project depends to produce its power revenues are in litigation now and may never be available for use by the power dams in this project. Why do I say that? Because the whole financial structure of the Colorado River storage project depends upon power production at Glen Canyon Dam, and this in turn depends on whether or not the upper basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right, as against the lower basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if it is needed for domestic and agricultural uses in the lower basin. The upper-basin spokesmen are in disagreement among themselves on this point. Governor Johnson, of Colorado, submitted a prepared statement in the Senate hearings in which he said:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin.

Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the 7-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the 7-State compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Governor Johnson bases his contention on articles III (e) and IV (b) of the Colorado River compact, which provide:

ART. III(e). The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

ART. IV (b). Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

If Governor Johnson is right, all the estimates of power revenues at Glen Canyon are wrong, because they are based upon the assumption that if the upper-basin States release to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet in each 10 years—the minimum required by article III (d) of the compact—they may keep everything else. Even at that, it would take 25 years to fill Glen Canyon Dam if the next quarter century is as dry as the last 25 years.

These questions of interpretation of the Colorado River compact are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California, et al. Whether or not the upper States, who have been impleaded by California, become parties to that case, the Court cannot divide the water in the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada, without ascertaining how much water these States have a right to receive from the four upper States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions in Glen Canyon Dam on an interpretation of the Colorado River compact which is challenged by the Governor of Colorado, and may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is already pending in that Court. The consideration of this bill should await the Supreme Court decision.

Also in that court dispute is the question whether or not some millions of acre-feet of water annually of Indian claims to water are available.

Of course, when I mentioned Governor Johnson's statement a while ago saying that the water had to be let down, then I mentioned that the Bureau of Reclamation said "No," it could be stored. Who can say that an additional court case going to the Supreme Court will not have to be fought over this water, which could be lost, and which, therefore, has a bearing on whether or not the financial scheme of this project is unsound? True or false?

Mr. Speaker, I have made several statements with respect to the project being dangerous to agriculture in this country. I have said that the project would grow crops already in surplus. True or false?

I have the word of the Bureau of Reclamation on that and they have listed the crops that will be grown on the various projects and whether or not they are surplus. From Reclamation Bureau reports a table has been compiled showing every type of crop which would be grown on each of the 33 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops. Here is the table:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge-----	7, 970	Hay----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Seedskadee-----	60, 720	Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Lyman-----	40, 600	Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Silt-----	7, 300	Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Sugar beets----- Potatoes----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Smith Fork-----	10, 430	Hay----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Paonia-----	17, 040	Grain----- Fruit----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Florida-----	18, 950	Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Small grains----- Alfalfa----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Pine River-----	15, 150	Hay----- Small grains----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Beef cattle----- Dairy cows----- Fruit----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Emery County---	24, 080	Alfalfa----- Grains----- Beef cattle----- Dairy cows----- Fruit----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grain----- Fruit----- Sugar beets----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Central Utah-----	60, 380	Alfalfa----- Grain----- Fruit----- Sugar beets----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Beans----- Fruit----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Pasture----- Grain----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Hammond-----	3, 670	Alfalfa----- Grains----- Beans----- Fruit----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Pasture----- Grain----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Gooseberry-----	16, 400	Alfalfa----- Pasture----- Grain----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Fruit----- Vegetables----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Navaho-----	137, 240	Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Fruit----- Vegetables----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
San Juan-Chama--	225, 000	Alfalfa----- Grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Dairy cows----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Rabbit Ear-----	19, 190	Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Dairy cows----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Troublesome-----	13, 640	Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Dairy cows----- Alfalfa----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beans----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes.
West Divide-----	65, 610	Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Dairy cows----- Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beef cattle----- Sheep----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beans----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook--	31, 610	Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Dairy cows----- Sheep----- Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beans----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes.
Dolores-----	66, 000	Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beans----- Dairy cows----- Beef cattle----- Hay----- Pasture----- Small grains----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Sublette-----	84, 000	Alfalfa----- Small grains----- Pasture----- Beef cattle----- Sheep-----	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
Fruitgrowers-----	3,850	Alfalfa-----	
		Grain-----	Yes.
		Fruit-----	
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
Bostwick Park----	6,870	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
Dallas Creek-----	21,940	Alfalfa-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Pasture-----	
		Beef cattle-----	
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
		Sheep-----	Yes.
East River-----	2,750	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Beef cattle-----	
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
		Sheep-----	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa----	19,400	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
Grand Mesa-----	25,300	Alfalfa-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Pasture-----	
		Fruit-----	
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
Ohio Creek-----	16,910	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
Tomichi Creek----	27,580	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
Battlement Mesa----	6,830	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
Bluestone-----	10,875	Alfalfa-----	
		Grain-----	Yes.
		Vegetables-----	
		Fruit-----	
		Sugar beets-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
Eagle Divide-----	10,875	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
Parshall-----	27,510	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.
Woody Creek-----	2,965	Hay-----	
		Pasture-----	
		Small grains-----	Yes.
		Beef cattle-----	
		Sheep-----	Yes.
		Dairy cows-----	Yes.

I invite your attention to what the table says and to the large number of products now in surplus that would be produced if this project is allowed to pass this House.

Further, in evaluating whether or not the statement I made that this is dangerous to agriculture is true or false, I have pointed out that for the most part only marginal agricultural lands would be serviced by the project. That comes directly from the Bureau of Reclamation itself. Remember I said only marginal agricultural lands would be serviced by this project. True or false?

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the

lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under this bill, will be worth on the average only about \$150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average \$3,000 to \$5,000 per acre on the Bureau's figures. Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than \$100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

I have also said that there already exists 20 million acres of land in this country that could be put into production at considerably less than the cost of this project will require. I have said that. What are the facts? Is what I said true or false?

The Department of Agriculture settled that one when they submitted a tabulation showing there were 20 million acres of land in the humid areas of this country that could be put into production at a cost of from \$60 to \$100 an acre compared with the cost this project involves for its land.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States, as follows:

	Acres
Alabama-----	683,000
Arkansas-----	1,865,000
Florida-----	1,970,000
Georgia-----	1,721,000
Illinois-----	69,000
Indiana-----	135,000
Kentucky-----	170,000
Louisiana-----	2,769,000
Michigan-----	690,000
Minnesota-----	874,000
Mississippi-----	1,272,000
Missouri-----	323,000
New York-----	100,000
North Carolina-----	1,157,000
Ohio-----	95,000
Pennsylvania-----	90,000
South Carolina-----	996,000
Tennessee-----	242,000
Texas-----	3,928,000
Virginia-----	514,000
Wisconsin-----	316,000

I said also that in addition to these 20 million acres there exist 21 million additional acres of land that have been in agricultural production heretofore that is not today and could be put back into production. Is that true or is it false?

Well, I got these figures by having a man go to the Soil Conservation Service itself. True, the raw figures upon the books of the Soil Conservation Service were those taken through a survey in 1944, but consistently the keepers of the books said this, that there has been some in and some out. But, land in and land out just about balance each other out. So my figures are substantially correct, and as correct as anybody can get. They total up to almost 21 million acres of idle land. So, let me say this: We have heard that new agricultural land is needed, and I have said that this project is not the way to do it. True or false?

For your information, the statement I made on this subject was as follows:

WE ALREADY HAVE AN IMMENSE SOIL BANK

The President has made a very commendable proposal to relieve the farm problem by use of soil banks. Few people know that the deposits he envisions will be additional to nearly 21 million acres of fine farmland in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States already in the bank.

These 21 million acres are good cropland now lying idle in the farms of these 19 States—States and acreage amounts tabulated below. They are not woodland or pastureland. They are good, unused farmland in soil classes I, II, and III.

The interest the Nation will be paid by the existence of these two soil banks should not be diminished by inconsistent reclamation programs, such as the upper Colorado River project, which would bring large amounts of new land into production.

If 40 million acres are to be taken out of production, as proposed by the President, and placed in a soil bank and reserve for future use, then these idle 21 million acres must be added to the total. Thus, the proposed soil bank would have deposited in it a total of more than 60 million acres.

Early last fall I began a study to determine the amount of idle cropland in certain areas of the Nation.

Specifically, the question I wanted answered was this: How much good agricultural land is unused in farms in the humid sections of the United States?

PURPOSE OF SURVEY

Evidence has indicated to me that there was a large amount of good land in eastern, southern, and midwestern farms that was not producing crops.

How much?

In line with my opposition to the proposed multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project, I considered this a matter of great significance.

The upper Colorado River project would bring into production more than half a million acres of cropland, the major part of which would produce crops of the kind already in great surplus and heavily supported by the taxpayers.

In the present session of the Congress, the problem of our mounting surpluses has priority on the legislative calendar. Congress will consider a plan for decreasing the number of acres producing crops in surplus.

Yet, while Congress is struggling to decrease the number of acres now producing agricultural products, it is being asked to approve a gigantic irrigation project that would bring more acreage into production at extremely high cost.

Data before me at the time Congress adjourned last year showed that large amounts of the acreage contained in farms was literally soil in the bank. That is, we already had a large soil reserve that might be brought into production when and if this country needed it to produce food and fiber.

My observations were begun before any specific soil-bank program was officially tendered the Congress for consideration. Now that has been done. However, I shall not dwell on the present legislation designed to curtail our agricultural production and decrease the enormous load of surpluses.

I shall report on the findings of my study of idle land in farms. These findings show us that all during the time we have been burdened with the dilemma of a mounting agricultural surplus, we already had an enormous amount of our best farmland lying completely unused.

Here, on the one hand, are millions of acres of first-class agricultural land lying idle in areas of adequate rainfall. On the other hand, legislation before Congress proposes to spend enormous amounts of public money to bring more acreage into production in such developments as the upper Colorado

River project. In addition, the Reclamation Bureau is proposing an extensive program for developing hundreds of other projects, all designed to increase our agricultural production with money from the same taxpayers who are paying heavily to support crops and store them.

IDLE LAND SURVEY FINDINGS

My survey of idle land in farms showed there are nearly 21 million acres of fine farmlands now lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States.

In determining this total—precisely 20,937,153 acres—only agricultural lands in classes I, II, and III, the best farmland, was included in the survey.

The acreage tabulated was contained in privately owned farms.

Woodlands, pasture or lands owned by the Federal Government, municipalities, or school districts was not considered.

Some of the land tabulated had a history of agricultural usage, but was idle in all respects, according to the latest data available.

Official records of the United States Soil Conservation Service were the basic source of the information obtained. Permission to examine records and to confer with field officials was obtained from Soil Conservation Service headquarters.

A trained researcher visited each of the 19 States in which the survey was conducted, and at State headquarters of the Soil Conservation Service conferred with soil scientists and engineers.

Every effort was made to obtain the most factual data, and no information was included that was not approved by the Service officials.

THE STATES SURVEYED

The States in which my survey was conducted all lie in the humid section of the country, where crops depend upon rainfall, and where irrigation, if used, is supplemental. It is interesting to note that even in these sections of more-or-less dependable rainfall, supplemental irrigation is being used increasingly to assure annual production. Thus, in the Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern areas of the Nation, supplemental irrigation is helping to increase production and contributing to the prevention of crop failures.

The States selected for my study may be divided into three general geographic sections.

Midwestern States: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri.

Southern States: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky.

Southeastern States: Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia.

Tabulation of idle farmland, in classes I, II, and III only, in the South, Southeast, and Midwest as obtained from the U. S. Soil Conservation Service

SOUTH	
State:	Acre
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338

SOUTHEAST	
State:	Acre
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519

MIDWEST	
State:	Acre
Illinois	627,185
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

CONCLUSIONS

Here is evidence to show that while Congress is being asked to approve enormous costly new irrigation projects, at least 20,937,153 acres of the best American cropland are unused for any purpose.

Right now we have before us in Congress the gigantic upper Colorado River project. Unquestionably the most expensive and unsound scheme yet devised, it alone would bring into production more than half a million acres in high barren, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico.

With millions of acres of the best farmland awaiting the plow in areas where the rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, it is proposed to force this great new burden of the upper Colorado River project on the American taxpayers.

I consider the findings of this survey nothing short of amazing. In addition to the 21 million acres of the best farmland that is now idle in 19 States there are millions of other acres in lower soil classes and in other States that are idle in the humid area of the Nation. Much of this idle lower class land could be improved with little cost and developed into pasture.

These millions of idle acres of the best lands are close to markets, to population centers, with roads and transportation running through them, and with schools and municipal governments established.

Where the multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project would be built, there is little population, few roads, no metropolitan markets, few towns. The enormous cost of establishing municipal governments, police forces, schools, building of highways and new towns must be added to the cost of developing the arid lands.

It is an unbelievable proposal for the purpose of growing more farm products of the kinds already in great surplus while there are these millions of acres of good idle land in the Midwest, South, and East.

The Bureau of Reclamation would have us believe that we must spend billions to develop projects like the upper Colorado in order to provide food and fiber for our growing population.

That simply is not true. On the presently producing farmlands we are growing so much food and fiber that we cannot find adequate space to store it. The President has asked that 40 million acres of our presently producing lands be placed in a soil bank.

Each year new methods are reported for increasing per acre yields.

Yet the Bureau of Reclamation would have Congress appropriate billions of dollars for such unnecessary and wasteful projects as that proposed in the upper Colorado Basin. This project alone would saddle a new \$4 billion tax loss on the Nation's taxpayers. The four States benefiting would pay less than 2 percent of the cost. Taxpayers of the other 44 States would have to pay the balance.

The cost of bringing the millions of acres of good farmland now idle into full production would run from only \$15 to \$150 an acre—when and if they are needed.

Compare that with the \$5,000 an acre cost of building the upper Colorado project and you see how inconceivable the scheme is.

Bringing into production the good lands now idle in the East, Midwest, and South would cost the taxpayers nothing. In the upper Colorado project the taxpayers would have to pay not only the excessive cost of building the irrigation projects, the roads, schools and other necessary community projects, but then the taxpayers would have to subsidize the crops that would be grown, such as dairy products, grains and wool. The whole thing is nothing short of economic idiocy.

Well, of course, this is the fact. The fact is that with the 20 million acres that the Department of Agriculture says are available and with the 21 million acres of idle land, that is 41 million. The estimates are that by 1975 the additional needs of the country's increased population will be 100 million more acres and that 70 million of those acres will come from land capable of production, which leaves 30 million to go. Well, we have 41 million right here, so certainly my statement with respect to the agricultural effect of this project should be true.

*I most urgently commend to your attention Adm. Ben Moreell's recent remarks on water policy in regard to what I have just said on the agricultural problem. Here are extracts:

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, NATIONAL WATER POLICY CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, 1956

Federal water resource policy should be related to national policy in the determination of priorities for the uses of water. In particular, Federal policy should not encourage or condone the commitment of scarce water to meet needs of marginal utility or for uneconomic purposes.

A notable example of confusion in policy is our handling of croplands. We have a total of 350 million acres now being harvested. Another 134 million acres are available on existing farms but are not being harvested, although about half are used for pasture.

Irrigated lands in cultivation total 26 million acres. But of these, less than 7 million acres are on Federal projects, the remainder, 19 million acres, having been developed by private enterprise. While the current Federal program provides for bringing more land under irrigation at costs ranging up to \$1,500 per acre, the Department of Agriculture reports that 21 million acres of good cropland can be obtained by clearing and drainage works which would cost only \$175 an acre. During the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955, the Federal Government, under marketing quotas, removed 31 million acres from cultivation. And recently, we have learned that 40 million additional acres would be taken out of cultivation under the President's soil-bank plan.

Why should the Federal Government commit large quantities of precious water to provide increases of cropland acreage while, at the same time, it is forcing large-scale withdrawals of good lands from cultivation? Illogical allocations of water to agriculture, which is already burdened by oppressive surplus problems, will stifle industrial and urban development and will result in profligate waste. The spending of huge sums to bring more land under cultivation while the Government is paying even more money to take land out of cultivation is inexplicable—unless, of course, the primary purpose is to get rid of the money.

Now, I have also made several points with respect to the geology of this project, and you have all heard that. I said that this project should be delayed until

these geological questions are settled. True or false?

Well, that, of course, is a matter of opinion and speculation, and you cannot say whether that statement of opinion is true or false. I do not think that is what the Salt Lake paper is talking about, but I do think they are talking about a statement that I made that there could well be landslides of gigantic or earthquake proportions occur in the reservoir area of the Glen Canyon Dam and thereby imperil the financial ability of this project to pay back.

A number of you have seen this chinle shale that I sent to you and have watched it disintegrate, and I have pointed out that that would be a danger. True or false?

Well, there is approximately 50 miles of it, 47 miles to be exact, in the Glen Canyon reservoir area. The Bureau of Reclamation admits to knowing only about 14 miles in this entire area. It is usually found in areas where it is formed in cliffs 400 feet high, overlain by massive sandstone rock formation, which, when undermined by disintegration of the chinle, would crash down and fill up the reservoir. This picture I have here shows some of that type of disintegration, and I just want to read you an extract in determining whether what I have said is true or not, an extract from forgotten pamphlets down in the Bureau of Reclamation by a man who investigated the area for the Geological Survey back in 1931, Prof. Herbert E. Gregory. He wrote:

[Extracts from U. S. Geological Survey publications describing Chinle] —

THE KAIPAROWITS REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 164 (1931), by Herbert E. Gregory and Raymond C. Moore)

The Chinle formation includes the group of shales, "maris," thin, soft sandstones, and limestone conglomerates lying between the Shinarump conglomerate and the Wingate sandstone. * * *

Records show that the Chinle is thickest in northeastern Arizona and southwestern Utah * * * 320 to 393 feet in upper Glen Canyon, and 830 feet in the San Juan Canyon (p. 53).

A fragment of fresh rock immersed in water swells to nearly twice its bulk, and after drying is nothing more than a pile of disconnected, irregular grains; alternate drying and wetting produces a substance part of which passes through filter paper. Under the microscope, most of the material appears to be colloidal (p. 57).

When the Chinle maris and shales on steep slopes are saturated they seem to move by their own weight, carrying their broken strata and talus blocks to lower levels. At the south base of the Paria Plateau slides in the Chinle have spilled over the Shinarump conglomerate and down the Moenkopi cliffs to the Kaibab below, and at a place about 14 miles south of the Burr trail the Chinle beds have lost their hold and have slid, accompanied by huge fragments, over the upturned beds of Navaho sandstone, down the west side of the Halls Creek Valley in a jumbled mass that is roughly three-fourths of a mile wide, 1½ miles long, and 80 feet deep (p. 145).

As viewed from the rim of the Kaiparowits Plateau at Fifty-mile Point the landslides are impressive. The slopes below the capping Cretaceous sandstone constitute a field about 2 miles wide and 10 miles long, everywhere

strewn with boulders, the largest of which are square blocks of sandstone 40 feet thick. Successive slides have banked the materials in huge ridges like a series of terminal and lateral moraines.

Except in areas of Chinle and Tropic shales landslides were not observed. The steep slopes of other formations are bare or coated with only ribbons and scattered patches of debris (p. 146).

THE SAN JUAN REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 188 (1938), by Herbert E. Gregory)

The position of the relatively soft Chinle between two cliff makers accounts for its preservation in a region where erosion is vigorous (p. 49).

In the Chinle formation the conditions for producing slides are exceptionally favorable. The thin sandstone beds readily break into talus fragments, and the marl beds when saturated seem to move by their own weight. * * * Instability is further shown by mud flows that after heavy rainfall issue from the base of slides. In places recurrent movement is indicated by the arrangement of material in parallel ridges on Chinle slopes and by unconformities in the piles of debris successively pushed over cliffs (p. 102).

Note particularly Professor Gregory's description of a Chinle landslide 2 miles wide and 10 miles long. Well, 10 miles of land sliding down into a narrow reservoir is to my mind a landslide of earthquake proportions. The following is the statement I made respecting the Chinle question:

GLEN CANYON RESERVOIR PERILED BY CHINLE FORMATIONS

Gigantic landslides were pictured as possibly devastating the \$421 million Glen Canyon dam and reservoir, key unit of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project, by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, today.

Fifty miles of the immense walls of the long, narrow reservoir site are comprised of rock so soft that it swells to nearly twice its size and disintegrates when touched by water, HOSMER declared. The reservoir would extend 186 miles along the Colorado River and 70 miles along the San Juan River.

The soft rock—known as Chinle shale—forms immense cliffs in numerous areas that would be covered by water impounded by the proposed 700-foot high Glen Canyon dam. The dam, known as the "cash register" of the upper Colorado project now before Congress, was designed to produce power revenues to pay off some 30 other units of the project that cannot pay for themselves.

HOSMER stated that he had been advised by independent geologists that the reservoir's water would swiftly disintegrate the Chinle shale, and it would flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks, HOSMER said. All of the broken debris, the Congressman explained, including blocks of sandstone as big as houses, would move downslope and partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in the extensive areas of Chinle shale.

"If this is permitted to happen," said HOSMER, "the finances of the entire upper Colorado River project would collapse with it."

"The Nation's taxpayers would be left with a billion-dollar mud puddle."

"Congress should withhold any consideration of the legislation pending a full and complete geological survey and report of the site."

HOSMER's sensational charges were based on a personal investigation he made of the

reservoir area last December in the company of two independent consulting geologists. The expedition was made by helicopter to remote sections of the reservoir site in northern Arizona and southern Utah. Several hundred pounds of the Chinle shale were gathered and flown out for laboratory tests.

Using samples of the Chinle rock he obtained in Glen Canyon, HOSMER demonstrated the rapidity with which it turns to mud when placed in an ashtray containing a small amount of water.

"I am presenting to Congress reports of the distinguished geologists who accompanied me to Glen Canyon," HOSMER said. "These reports show that if this Chinle shale is brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir it would immediately disintegrate and flow down slope into the reservoir."

"Obviously, with evidence such as this, obtained from unimpeachable sources, the least that can be said is that there are sound reasons why Congress should not approve this immense investment of public money."

HOSMER said that the geological investigation and the collection of rock samples was done by Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists.

He stated that landslides which could occur would be of unbelievable size to anyone except a geologist. Much of the Chinle shale, now dry, supports several hundred feet of overlying Wingate and Navaho sandstone which would collapse into the reservoir when the Chinle disintegrated in water.

"The size of the landslides which could occur may be pictured by considering the fact that the Chinle itself has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, for instance. On top of the Chinle are the great cliff-forming sandstones."

"The whole upper Colorado River project would cost the taxpayers more than \$4 billion, and it would be entirely unworkable without Glen Canyon to produce power revenues," HOSMER said.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this. I want to know if the provisions of this bill are broad enough to provide that every citizen of southern California might have a handful of rainmaking pellets. In southern California you have a situation where there are more clouds for rainmaking and they are confined closer than any place in the country. It is the only place I know of where with a handful of pellets you can sow clouds at arm's length and cause it to rain on your feet while your head remains perfectly dry.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, that is not much of a parliamentary inquiry, but I hope the gentleman is happy that he has made some kind of a point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who answered that parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. I have also said that there is a great possibility that this Glen Canyon Reservoir would never hold water even if the dam were built. True or false? Again, that is a statement of opinion, but let us see whether the facts I have stated with regard to it are true or false.

I have said that there exist in the area of the reservoir gigantic geological downwarps. These are simply the ground formations swinging down into little valleys and going underground.

I have said that this area is Navaho sandstone. I do not think there is any question about that. I point to the existence of these downwarps. I have had the Geological Survey draw a map showing them so there would not be any question about their existence, if you are going to believe the Geological Survey.

I have also said that this Navaho sandstone has a porosity of 22 percent. That was admitted at the hearing.

I have also said that it is quite possible that these tremendous downwarps which have such a vast capacity might be dry and therefore drain off any water that started to be impounded behind the reservoir. The following is the complete text of my statement on this subject:

GREATEST ENGINEERING BLUNDER IN OUR HISTORY

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, said today that gigantic Glen Canyon Dam, \$421 million main unit of the proposed upper Colorado River project, could become the "greatest engineering blunder in our history," because water for the project would pour into two enormous subterranean sieve-like basins, instead of flowing through the dam to make hydroelectric power.

"Alongside of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir are two underground basins of almost unbelievable size. Once the 700-foot high dam was built across the Colorado River, the flow of water could back up and pour into these immense sieves," HOSMER stated.

"One of these great subbasements of the earth is known as the Kaiparowits Basin. It would hold at least 250 million acre-feet of water. The other is the Henry Mountains Basin, and it would hold 100 million acre-feet of river water. (Note: An acre-foot of water is enough water to cover 1 acre of ground a foot deep.)

"That is 350 million acre-feet of water, or at least 26 years' flow of the whole Colorado River at this point.

"If adequate power cannot be produced by the dam to pay its cost, it hardly seems reasonable to build it and force this great new loss on the taxpayers of the Nation."

HOSMER said that scientific data in his hands make it doubtful that Glen Canyon Reservoir could be filled "in our lifetime," and doubtful as well that adequate power could be produced by the dam.

"This matter demands an exhaustive investigation by independent geologists and engineers who have no personal interest in the project," HOSMER declared.

The Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains basins would hold enough water to cover the District of Columbia to a depth of 8,000 feet.

That is enough water to serve the people of New York City for 98,000 days, or 268 years.

"Here, based on sound geological reports, we have the frightening spectacle of the whole Colorado River flowing for years into gigantic underground sponges," said HOSMER.

"The great dam that is proposed here would stand as a towering monument to engineering folly and a memorial to the wanton waste of all these millions.

"These endless cellars are immediately adjacent to the reservoir site and are 2,000 feet in depth below the river. There are miles and miles of rock of great porosity through which the river water would flow away, to be forever lost to use in the cavernous depths of the earth.

"This rock is marked by enormous cracks and fissures which I have observed myself as late as last December. Water backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam could have free flowing passage into them and into the great basin through them. Undoubtedly many of these cracks and fissures occurred during the gigantic geologic earth movements that created these tremendous downwarps.

"Such a loss would be a major tragedy. In addition to the great money loss to all taxpayers, the entire economy of most of the West would be irreparably damaged. This in turn would effect the welfare of the entire Nation."

HOSMER said that last December, in the company of geologists Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, he made an examination of the Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir area in northern Arizona and southern Utah. The country contains no roads, and the trip was made by helicopter. Sample of Navaho sandstone and Chinle shale rock were brought out from the reservoir site.

HOSMER quoted from a report submitted to him by Dr. Hoots as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure."

HOSMER emphasized that the Bureau of Reclamation has reported favorably on the proposed upper Colorado River project and its chief unit, Glen Canyon Dam, without adequate information as to the practicability of the project, without proper engineering studies, and without determining the immensity of water losses that would occur.

In House Document No. 364 of the 83d Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation's explanation of the project, a startling admission is made as to water losses of an unexplained nature in the San Juan Basin, into which the reservoir's waters would extend and which is crossed by the Henry Mountains downwarp.

HOSMER quoted the following from the document (p. 180):

"Unexplained losses of water have been reported also in the San Juan River Basin. The proposed study in the vicinity of the Navaho Reservoir is for the purpose of evaluating this loss, and determining the quantities that are lost by evaporation and transpiration."

In connection with these structural basins, House Document No. 364 adds (pp. 180-181):

"There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir."

HOSMER stated: "I most emphatically agree with Dr. Hoots and other eminent geologists and engineers that the Glen Canyon reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. This is evident from statements made by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

"Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies."

I have not just dreamed up those figures, taken them out of the thin air and as to whether they are true or false, I want you to look at the record that I am going to include with my remarks. This is in a report of a Ph. D. geologist who probably knows more about rocks and downwarps and leakage than any of us here do. He says that it will go in there, if those things are not now full of water. This is Hoots' statement:

MEMORANDUM ON GEOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED GLEN CANYON DAM SITE AND RESERVOIR AREA IN NORTHERN ARIZONA AND SOUTHEASTERN UTAH

(By Harold W. Hoots, consulting geologist, Los Angeles, Calif., December 29, 1955)

The writer was requested by Hon. CRAIG HOSMER to undertake a geological investigation of the proposed Glen Canyon dam site at Mile 15 on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, and the proposed reservoir area located principally in southeastern Utah and extending 186 river miles up the Colorado River from Mile 15, and 71 miles up the San Juan River.

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this investigation was three-fold, namely:

(1) To inspect in the field critical geological aspects of the proposed Glen Canyon dam site and reservoir area, and to collect rock samples considered essential to this investigation;

(2) To review: (a) existing conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the proposed dam site; and (b) published geological data pertinent to the proposed dam site and reservoir area, for the purpose of appraising the adequacy of geological investigations that preceded the recommendation of this construction project; and

(3) To ascertain from tests by qualified engineering laboratories certain critical physical properties of rocks exposed at the proposed Glen Canyon dam site and in the reservoir area.

PROCEDURE

Field work

The geological investigation and collection of rock samples in the field was done by Harold W. Hoots and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists, December 12-14, 1955. Transportation by helicopter made it possible not only to inspect the geology of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir area from the air, but also to land at strategic localities for the examination of rock outcrops and the collection of rock samples along both the Colorado River and the San Juan River.

Several hundred pounds of rock samples were collected, flown out by helicopter, and shipped for laboratory determination of certain physical properties of the Navaho sandstone and the Chinle shale. Samples of water from the Colorado River and the San Juan River also were collected for use in conducting laboratory tests on rock samples under conditions that would approach actual field conditions within the proposed reservoir area.

Photographs were taken to illustrate the erosional characteristics of rock formations critical to the proposed reservoir area, and to emphasize the difficulty and tremendous expense involved in constructing a dam that would adequately protect Rainbow Bridge from destruction by the proposed reservoir.

Laboratory tests of rock samples

The more important of the laboratory tests were directed toward:

(1) Determination of the permeability and porosity of the Navaho sandstone which forms the walls of the Canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

These tests were made with water from the Colorado and San Juan Rivers, and were designed to duplicate, insofar as possible, conditions that would exist within the proposed reservoir. Their purpose was to determine: (a) the ability of this Navaho sandstone to absorb water from the reservoir; (b) the capacity of the pore-spaces within a unit volume of this sandstone; (c) the total quantity of reservoir that could be lost by leakage through the sandstone walls of the proposed reservoir, and thence by natural gravity drainage into the large structural basins known to extend from the Colorado River for many miles to the north; (d) the magnitude of the leakage that might occur around the abutments of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam at mile 14; and (e) whether Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be protected from flooding by a dam built in this sandstone.

(2) Determination of the physical characteristics of the Chinle shale which outcrops, and would be covered by water, along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

The purpose of these tests was to determine the ability of the Chinle shale to maintain its position and physical strength when saturated with water, and, under these conditions, to support the load of several hundred feet of overlying cliff-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstone, and to thus prevent the ultimate loss of much of the calculated capacity of the proposed reservoir.

Office studies and preparation of this memorandum

Critical review of available information bearing directly on investigations of, and recommendations made for, the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir was essential to this investigation and the preparation of this memorandum. Particular attention has been devoted to (1) published and mimeographed reports by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey on the geology and ground water of the area containing the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir area; (2) to the adequacy of the investigations made by the Bureau of Reclamation of the physical character of the Navaho sandstone at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site, and to the extent that the Chinle shale in the reservoir area will increase sedimentation and reduce the storage capacity and usefulness of the reservoir; and (3) the problems and expense involved in the construction of a dam designed to protect the Rainbow Bridge, and the uncertainty that such a dam would actually provide this protection.

FINDINGS

The Navaho Sandstone

The canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir is composed entirely of Navaho sandstone. This sandstone, as it occurs in this region, is described by Dr. Herbert E. Gregory and Dr. Raymond C. Moore¹ as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone is essentially an aggregate of white, crystal-clear quartz grains, loosely held together with cement. * * * In general the cement is weak. Even where iron oxide forms the bond, it is not easy to obtain a well-trimmed hand specimen, and much of the rock exposed at the

surface is so friable that it crushes under the foot, and a single blow of the hammer may reduce a block of sandstone to a mass of dust. Blasting this rock with powder presents special difficulties."

J. W. Harshbarger, C. A. Repenning, and J. T. Callahan² of the United States Geological Survey, make the following statement regarding the Navaho sandstone:

"One striking feature of this sandstone is its great permeability and capacity to absorb, immediately, a substantial portion of the light precipitation. Evidence of this rapid absorption is the extremely small amount of runoff from the area of outcrop. * * * Undoubtedly the Navaho sandstone transmits water more freely than any other water bearer in the region."

Laboratory tests of porosity and permeability

Samples of Navaho sandstone collected from the lower part of the canyon wall at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam were determined to have a porosity varying from 24.3 percent to 25.5 percent, and an average porosity of 25 percent. One acre-foot of this sandstone thus has sufficient porosity to contain one-fourth of one acre foot of water.

The permeabilities of these samples of Navaho sandstone to air were found to be uniformly high, to vary from 4,920 to 5,180 millidarcys, and to average 5,060 millidarcys. Their permeabilities to Colorado River water under normal vertical hydrostatic gradient for 100 hours averaged, at the end of this 100-hour period, 1,330 millidarcys. Permeabilities of this magnitude permit comparatively rapid movement of water into and through the Navaho sandstone.

Significance of established porosity and permeability: The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure. Several such areas of lower pressure adjoin the proposed reservoir and are tabulated below:

1. The sandstone walls of the canyon adjacent to the proposed dam and the lower end of the proposed reservoir: Average permeability of this sandstone indicates that in excess of 15 million gallons of water may leak around the abutments of the proposed dam every day.

2. The Kaiparowits downwarp or structural basin: This geologic feature, one of the major structural basins of this region, extends from the lower part of the proposed reservoir northwestward for 70 miles. (See accompanying map of A. A. Baker of United States Geological Survey). It is a magnificent natural basin for containing water in volume many times that calculated for the proposed Glen Canyon reservoir.

Access of water to this basin from the proposed reservoir is provided by porous and permeable Navaho sandstone walls along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir immediately above the proposed dam. This basin covers over 1,700 square miles and has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 250 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon reservoir is full. Since this capacity is about 10 times that calculated for storage in the proposed Glen Canyon reservoir, it is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

3. The Henry Mountains basin: This geologic feature crosses the Colorado River about 45 river miles above the mouth of the

² The Navaho Country, Arizona-Utah-New Mexico, included in the Physical and Economic Foundation of Natural Resources, p. 121, by Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, U. S. Congress, 1952.

San Juan River. It is similar to the Kaiparowits basin in its geologic character and ability to drain water from the proposed reservoir. It has ready access to the reservoir through permeable Navaho sandstone walls along many river miles of the proposed reservoir, and it has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 100 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon reservoir is full. It is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

4. The Rainbow Bridge National Monument: This area, it is proposed, is to be protected from flooding by a dam built in the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone, but regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subjected to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir through the Navaho sandstone.

The Chinle shale

The Chinle shale is exposed along the canyon walls of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers for an aggregate distance of about 50 river miles within the proposed reservoir area. Its importance to the proposed reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks.

The Chinle shale is a fine-textured, bentonitic-type rock that varies in color from gray to blue, red, and purple. When exposed to the elements it has little resistance to erosion, and when brought in contact with water it expands and rapidly disintegrates to a shapeless mass of mud.

If brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir this Chinle shale, which now is partially protected in canyon walls above the river level, would immediately disintegrate and flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks in extensive areas bordering the proposed reservoir. All of the broken debris resulting from this collapse would move downslope and would partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in these extensive areas of Chinle outcrop.

Field and laboratory investigations of the character, distribution, thickness, and geological relations of the Chinle shale strongly indicate that this formation, if brought in contact with water in the proposed reservoir, would contribute materially to rapid diminution of the capacity and usefulness of the reservoir for water storage.

The Chinle shale is not thin. According to H. D. Miser³ this formation has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River. Its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the nearby Colorado River appears to be similar.

LACK OF ADEQUATE INFORMATION

It is essential that the expenditure of money required for the proposed Glen Canyon Dam project be supported and justified by adequate data, and expert appraisal and interpretation of these data. Published statements by the United States Geological Survey emphasize the fact that a vast quantity of data essential to a technical evaluation of the soundness of this project has not been obtained.

The following quotations of statements by the United States Geological Survey are taken from pages 178-182 of House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, entitled "Colorado Storage Project."

³ The San Juan Canyon, U. S. Geological Survey water supply paper 538, fig. 2, p. 34, 1924.

¹ The Kaiparowits Region, U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 164, pp. 65 and 66, 1931.

Page 178, second paragraph: "Although much information on water resources of the upper Colorado River basin already has been collected, available records fall far short of presenting the complete understanding of water resources which will be needed for purposes of the storage plan outlined in this report, and for full utilization of the waters allocated to the respective States under the terms of the upper Colorado River basin compact. Detailed geologic maps and data for the upper Colorado River basin are inadequate, and in large areas they are entirely lacking. The topographic mapping essential for inventory of both water resources and mineral resources is likewise far from adequate. Only 11 percent of the basin is adequately mapped, and mapping is in progress in an additional 2 percent of the area."

Special erosion and sedimentation studies, page 179, first and second paragraphs):

"The Colorado River has always been outstanding in sediment transportation, and has been cited as a horrible example of land erosion and soil wastage by many writers. The sediment has been a vexing problem in the preparation of the storage project." * * *

"* * * Far more research is needed before reliable predictions can be made as to sedimentation in the future, and before evaluation can be made of proposed preventive measures. * * * A complete analysis of the problem will involve study also of meteorological aspects, as well as soils and vegetative cover—that is, coordination of effort among the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, and agencies of the Department of Agriculture."

Special water-loss studies—page 179, last paragraph: "In the case of Glen Canyon, it has been estimated that evaporation losses would average about 63 inches annually, of which 54 inches would be chargeable to the basin. These estimates are based on very meager data as to evaporation from free water surfaces, and transfers of data from remote areas in the case of natural losses from the stream. Detailed investigations have not been made of evaporation from streams in the basin under varying conditions of turbulence, or of evapotranspiration from riparian vegetation or from flood plains bordering the streams."

Glen Canyon Reservoir and vicinity, Arizona and Utah, page 180, last paragraph, and page 181, first and second paragraphs:

"Topographic mapping of more than 2,600 square miles has a high priority for the Glen Canyon project. Geologic mapping of a slightly smaller area along the Colorado and San Juan Rivers is proposed. The rocks cropping out in the reservoir area are predominantly sandstone, as shown by geologic reconnaissance. It is known that structural basins lie northwest of the reservoir site under the Kaiparowits Plateau and also under the Henry Mountains. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir."

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amount of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir. * * *

"The Glen Canyon Reservoir will extend upstream into Cataract Canyon, where gypsum and salt of the Paradox formation crop out near the river level in several places. The possible effect of these rocks upon the quality of water in the reservoir should be investigated."

Classification of Federal Lands for Water Development, page 182, first paragraph: "The Geological Survey is responsible for classification of Federal lands as to their water-storage and water-power values. These values are dependent in part upon the upper basin's ability to furnish water to the lower basin as required by compact, and dependent therefore upon the Colorado River storage project. Many of the streams in the basin are not adequately mapped, and geological investigations of possible dam sites must precede any classification as to their water-power or water-storage value."

CONCLUSIONS

The Glen Canyon Reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. It is evident from the above quoted statements by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of (1) the magnitude and rapidity of water-loss that can be expected from the proposed reservoir into the large Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains' Basins; (2) the extent to which the disintegration of water-soaked Chinle shale and other similar formations will reduce the capacity and usefulness of the proposed reservoir; and (3) how the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassable terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can protect this National Monument from flooding.

HAROLD W. HOOTS,
Consulting Geologist.

And if you go to House Document No. 364, which is the basic document on this matter, you will find that the Bureau itself admitted that they did not know whether these downwarps are dry, wet, or in what state they were. My statement above contains excerpts from this document.

MR. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, for whom I have a very high regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas for an inquiry on the question of personal privilege? The Chair will state that the inquiry has to be confined to the question of personal privilege. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas for that purpose?

MR. HOSMER. I thought I was yielding for a question. I do not wish to yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question the gentleman asks must relate to the question of personal privilege.

MR. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to frame a question under

that definition. I shall be glad to ask my question and if the Chair thinks it is not pertinent, I shall withdraw it.

The gentleman has made a very careful study of this project and he has given us some valuable information. I wanted simply to ask whether in the course of his investigation he has found anything good in the project. I ask that seriously. I have not made up my mind. I want to hear both sides. I have no interest in this measure but almost everything has something good in it and I want to find out frankly from the gentleman if there was any phase of this project that had any merit, in his opinion.

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may propound a parliamentary inquiry, may I answer that question and still be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may use his own judgment and the Chair will pass on the question, if the gentleman answers it, as to whether it is subject to a point of order.

MR. HOSMER. I shall merely say yes, that I have. Because I have also said about the project that there is a great amount of uranium it will cover up and that will be in it, and we will be losing a valuable resource, a great amount of uranium deposits. True or false?

I have here a letter from a geological consultant, not from Los Angeles, not from Riverside, Pasadena, or Cucamonga, but from the heart of Utah, a town named Moab. In evaluating whether or not my statement is true or false, I want you to hear what he says:

GEOLOGICAL CONSULTANT SERVICE,
Moab, Utah, February 1, 1956.

HON. CRAIG HOSMER,
United States Representative, California,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading your protest of the construction of the dam under the proposed Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, in the Salt Lake Tribune dated January 31, I would like to commend you on your stand.

However, as a geological consultant with over 3 years' experience in uranium, and associated minerals, of the Colorado Plateau in general and with the Glen Canyon area in particular; perhaps you have overlooked a most vital reason for objecting to the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project.

No mention was made of the uranium deposits, now so vital to our national defense and national economy, which would be buried under millions of tons of water and which could never be recovered if the Glen Canyon area was flooded by the Colorado River storage project.

I have recently completed a comprehensive geological examination and report on the Glen Canyon area for several large uranium companies. This examination required approximately 4 months of detailed field study of the area in question, and consisted of both aerial reconnaissance and exhaustive field investigations. During this time I flew Glen Canyon and the canyons of the San Juan in a chartered super cub for the purpose of mapping detailed structural and sedimentary geology. I flew in and along the canyons for a distance of approximately 100 miles. Outcrops of considerable importance were noted on the map and were subsequently re-visited by use of a jeep and by foot. During this period I flew for 3 days giving adequate time for this examination.

Several trips into the area required camping and long stays as it is quite far from the

nearest settlements. During these trips I examined numerous Chinle-Shinarump sandstone lenses and paleo-stream channels which are one of the most important guides to the discovery of uranium deposits on the Colorado Plateau. Enclosed you will find several pictures taken during the examination, containing notes on the reverse side, regarding their importance and location. If the Colorado River storage project is completed and a dam constructed, it is probable that all of the pictured area, in addition to a great proportion of the area examined, will be inundated and rendered useless to the Nation.

For example, the Whilwind Mine located in section 2, T 41 S, R 13 E, has produced over 1,000 tons of uranium ores. It is probable the waters backed up by the dam will flood the Whilwind property and parts of Copper Canyon, Nokai Canyon, and most important Oljetoh Wash, wherein is located some of the best uranium mines on the Colorado Plateau. Also, Industriol Uranium Corp. has just recently blocked out an estimated 125,000 tons of uranium ore. Other major deposits situated in Oljetoh Wash are the Mitten-Skyline, Koley-Black, and several other interests too numerous to mention.

The Chinle formation in the area which probably would be covered by water possesses a great potential of uranium reserves, and that any destruction will be of considerable detriment to our national defense and economy; therefore, in the best interest of the Nation I would like to voice my support in your stand.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. GRANDBOUCHE,
Geological Consultant.

Mr. DIES. That answers my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOSMER. As a matter of fact, there has been a persistent difficulty in getting geological information out of the Bureau of Reclamation concerning this project.

Secretary McKay himself exuded doubts about the geologic capability of Glen Canyon to support a 700-foot dam; doubts which I have expressed and to which the Salt Lake paper may have been referring. Here is the statement I made on the subject:

PLANS FOR HUGE UPPER COLORADO DAM
UNCERTAIN, SAYS SECRETARY MCKAY

Proponents of the upper Colorado storage project are asking Congress to authorize an appropriation of \$421 million for a gigantic power dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz., without knowing whether the rock foundations at the site would support the immense structure as it would have to be built to integrate with other overall features of the project.

This amazing fact was disclosed in a letter written November 30, 1954, by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club.

Glen Canyon is on the Colorado River, and the proposed dam would be a key structure designed to raise power revenues to help pay for the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project (H. R. 270) now before Congress.

In his letter, Secretary McKay stated that the materials on which the dam would stand are "poorly cemented and relatively weak * * * in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams." The Secretary also revealed that "experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful."

Further, although the Bureau has presented preliminary plans for a 700-foot dam, it does not intend to present final specifica-

tions for it until after Congress has approved the present vague project.

On this subject, Secretary McKay wrote Brower:

"Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction."

Despite this situation, great pressure is on Congress to approve the project. After that is done the Reclamation Bureau would conduct studies to determine what size and type of dam can be built. In other words, Congress is being asked to approve spending this great sum of Federal money when Reclamation Bureau engineers themselves don't know what the final plans and designs may be, how big the dam would be, how much it would cost, how much power revenues it would bring, and when there are grave doubts that such a structure would be secure.

Thus, Congress is being asked to buy a "pig in a poke."

The Secretary's disclosures refute a 1950 report of the Reclamation Bureau which stated that the rock at the dam site "is remarkably free of structural defects."

This 1950 report also said: "The Glen Canyon site is geologically favorable for a high concrete dam."

Secretary McKay told Brower:

"Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. DEXHEIMER made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam."

It has been the custom of the Reclamation Bureau to secure authorization of a project based on a cost estimate which they assure Congress will be ample. However, it is rarely found that these cost estimates prove sufficient. Actual costs of projects usually have been 50 to 100 percent greater than the estimates made at the time of authorization.

The obvious result has been that the Bureau's assurances of economic and financial feasibility have collapsed.

The financial plan for the whole upper Colorado River project sets up Glen Canyon Dam as the "cash register" for the development.

Yet, the Reclamation Bureau apparently does not yet know how much Glen Canyon Dam would cost or how much revenue it can be expected to produce.

In the face of these uncertainties Congress should not approve this project.

The full text of Secretary McKay's letter follows:

"Mr. DAVID R. BROWER,
"Executive Director, Sierra Club,
"San Francisco, Calif.

"MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of Septem-

ber 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

"It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are underway by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time.

"On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. DEXHEIMER made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

"Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

"Sincerely yours,"

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

After hearing the following testimony during subcommittee hearings:

EXTRACTS OF PAGE 245, PART I, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, MARCH 10, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Have you done any work upstream from this site? (Glen Canyon Dam site.)

Mr. DEXHEIMER (Commissioner of Reclamation). Nothing but geological exploration, of course, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What is that—surface exploration?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Largely.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far back up the stream from the proposed dam site would the reservoir extend?

Mr. LARSON. 186 miles up the Colorado and 71 miles up the San Juan. I mentioned it in my statement.

Mr. HOSMER. Then you have taken visual surface geology in those extensive areas only?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes. I am sure that our geologists have covered that reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. Well, surface geology?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes.

Mr. HOSMER. You were in the office 6 years. Do you know of any of the results of that work?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. It has been some time since I went over the geologist's reports, and I am not familiar enough now to say that I remember just what they were. But those reports, of course, were fundamental to the selection of this site and the reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. You cannot tell us what is in them at the present time?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. No, I cannot.

I wrote the subcommittee chairman as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1955.
Re Upper Colorado Basin storage project hearings
Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Irrigation and Reclamation
Subcommittee, Interior and Insular
Affairs Committee, House of Repre-
sentatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ASPINALL: During the questioning of Interior Department witnesses on March 10 it became apparent that those present had no geological information of pertinence to the subcommittee in evaluating the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and its accompanying reservoir. In response to my questions it was admitted that such information was in the possession of the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation. Commissioner Dexheimer nevertheless testified in his opening statement (on p. 2) that the geology at Glen Canyon Dam site would be a matter of discussion.

It is therefore respectfully requested that when the Bureau witnesses return for further questioning that they be accompanied by someone fully conversant with the geology at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir site so that questioning with respect to same may be carried on.

If this be impractical from any standpoint, including the fact that such questioning may involve a considerable amount of the subcommittee's time, then alternatively it is requested that specially designated members, including myself, be authorized to hold special hearings in Denver on the question at a mutually convenient time.

The reason for this request is that doubts have been expressed as to the suitability of geological formations at the proposed location for the intended purposes. The magnitude of the proposed investment of public funds thereat would seem to make it mandatory that these doubts be resolved.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

(Copies to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation.)

A geologist was produced subsequently who testified, in part, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF PAGE 362, PART I, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, APRIL 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Now, I believe the proposed lake would extend about 190 miles up the Colorado River.

Mr. MURDOCK (J. Neli Murdock, regional geologist, Bureau of Reclamation). Approximately that. River miles.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far up the other river?

Mr. MURDOCK. Sixty-one miles, approximately.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the San Juan River?

Mr. MURDOCK. The San Juan River.

Mr. HOSMER. During all this time, are you in the Navaho sandstone formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. No, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What else do you get into?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you go up the Colorado River and you get into the older shales, Triassic shales, and into the limestones.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; you get into the Kayenta formation and the Triassic formations, too.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. It is more permeable than the Navaho sandstone; is it?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; all the formations are more permeable in that area than the Navaho.

Mr. HOSMER. It is a less homogeneous formation than the Navaho; is it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. It contains some sand and some gravel?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the permeability of this formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Very low. We did not make any tests on it. But it is very tight.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures whatsoever?

Mr. MURDOCK. No.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures for the Triassic (which includes Chinle)?

Mr. MURDOCK. No laboratory figures, but shale formations are recognized as impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. That is not altogether true, is it, Mr. Murdock?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you might find exceptions, but in the oil business they utilize this, because the shales are impermeable and they trap the oil in the sands.

Mr. HOSMER. That is true with a subsurface formation, but I am talking about a formation that is fairly close to the surface.

Mr. MURDOCK. Surface formation has nothing to do with the permeability of the shale. It breaks down into a clay, which again is impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. Depending upon its extent of saturation at the time you measured it; is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I don't think saturation has anything to do with permeability.

That Triassic about which he testified, including as it does the Chinle shale, which most of you saw disintegrate in water before your eyes, I believe lends credence to what I may say about the geology of the project which may be in conflict with the Bureau of Reclamation's statements upon which the Salt Lake paper appears to rely.

I have also said Rainbow Bridge could be endangered by the project. True or false? Here are the facts taken from a statement, in part, by Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., consulting geologist made December 29, 1955:

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of: * * * how the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassible terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can

protect this national monument from flooding.

I want you to determine whether this is true or false. I have said that you can no more take this Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado projects than you can abolish history by tearing out the page in the book that it is written upon.

I have carefully documented that allegation in a statement I released on February 15 of this year citing 17 instances in the record of the hearings before the committee on this bill, the first of which was by Mr. Ralph Tudor, then an official; I think he was Reclamation Commissioner. When asked about taking out Echo Park he said:

I might say it would be like taking the pistons out of an engine. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted.

Here is my full statement:

TO SAVE DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MUST KILL EN-
TIRE UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Representative CRAIG HOSMER said today he was informed that supporters of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument were planning to take the dam "temporarily out of the upper Colorado River project bill as a subterfuge to secure approval of the controversial project by the House."

"Probably never before in our history has such a storm of public protest been created against a power project as that which is now raging against the plan to build a large dam and reservoir at Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument," HOSMER said.

"So intensive has been the opposition to it from every part of the Nation that I understand the project's proponents are contemplating arrangements under which they would appear to be removing Echo Park Dam from the bill," he added.

The dam is a key unit of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project in Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming.

"On January 18, 1954, Ralph A. Tudor, then Under Secretary of the Interior, testified before the House Interior Committee that Echo Park is a necessary part of the upper Colorado project," HOSMER stated. Mr. Tudor was questioned by Representative CLAIR ENGLE as follows:

"Mr. ENGLE. In order to get something constructive done for the upper basin, it might be more intelligent to take Echo Park out and proceed with less controversial features, and perhaps explore Echo Park and its alternates a little further. That is why I ask if taking Echo Park out would be like taking the engine out of an automobile.

"Mr. TUDOR. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of an automobile, then?

"Mr. TUDOR. I might say, like taking the pistons out * * *

"Mr. TUDOR (later). We definitely feel that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted."

HOSMER declared:

"Removal of Echo Park Dam from the bill under such circumstances would be at the most a subterfuge. The action would do no more than accomplish the temporary deletion of the national monument dam from the project measure.

"The only result would be that if the bill went to conference, even next year of later, the project's proponents would come back and say: Give us the pistons for our en-

gine * * * give us Echo Park * * * the thing will not work without it.

"Reasons for the Echo Park removal strategy are plain.

"The upper Colorado River project has already passed the Senate in S. 500. Echo Park Dam is in that bill. An amendment to remove it was defeated on the Senate floor.

"The vigorous efforts of opponents of the project, who fear that the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument would open the door to further intrusion upon the sanctity of our national parks, fell before the strength of Senators from the States of the upper Colorado River Basin * * * Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona."

HOSMER pointed out that the supporters of the upper Colorado project "realize that strong opposition to Echo Park Dam would come from many Members of the House, should the bill reach the floor."

HOSMER added:

"Thus, the project's advocates have formulated strategy under which they would remove Echo Park Dam temporarily from the bill while it is in the House Interior Committee. This would be done for the purpose of getting the bill * * * minus Echo Park * * * before the whole House. With the controversial dam temporarily out of the bill, the proponents feel they have a better chance of securing passage by the House."

HOSMER asked:

"What would happen if that occurred?

"The Senate and House bills would be sent to a conference committee assigned to reconcile differences and submit to both bodies a conference report.

"It would be naive to presume that the Senate, in the face of the previous powerful support for the project containing Echo Park Dam, would reverse itself and accept a bill with Echo Park removed.

"It would be as naive to presume that a bill without Echo Park Dam in it would be reported by the conference committee.

"Should Echo Park Dam be removed by the House Interior Committee, and should such a bill pass the House, it is a foregone conclusion that the conference committee would restore Echo Park."

Striking the printed words "Echo Park Dam" from the bill cannot strike Echo Park Dam out of the project any more than "tearing a page out of a history book can abolish the history that was recorded there," HOSMER said.

"But this is the strategy of illusion which proponents of the project are now formulating in the hope of circumventing the vigorous opposition which has been engendered by Americans who wish to prevent spoliation of our national playgrounds," HOSMER continued.

He declared there were good reasons to fear that the building of Echo Park Dam would create a precedent, and there were many other good reasons for opposing the dam.

"In addition to the objectionable site, Echo Park Dam is an unsound project," HOSMER stated. "The financial structure on which it is proposed is so weak that it could not stand alone. In order to repay its cost, the dam must be supported by revenues from another power dam at Glen Canyon. Neither Glen Canyon nor Echo Park Dams store water which would be used for irrigation in the upper basin. They are designed solely for the purpose of supplying power which would be sold, perhaps, to pay for the reclamation units of the project. The latter could not pay for themselves. Without heavy subsidization they could not be constructed. The power rates at both Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams have been set at artificial levels, and there are grave doubts that this power could be purchased by consumers because of this high price.

"Echo Park Dam would ruin Dinosaur National Monument. It would flood some of the deepest, most spectacular and colorful canyons in the country. Well may the question be asked: If the boundaries of one national monument can be opened to the Bureau of Reclamation for power dams and immense reservoirs, why couldn't all national monuments be opened? There are statutes to prevent such a thing, but it is apparent that the Reclamation Bureau does not choose to abide by the statutes in the case of Dinosaur National Monument."

He charged that there have been previous efforts to invade our national parks and monuments, and said there are excellent power sites in Yellowstone, Glacier, and many other sanctuaries set aside for the enjoyment and edification of this and future generations.

"The effort to build Echo Park Dam might well be looked upon as a dinosaur-foot-in-the-door move," he declared, adding:

"You may be certain that as of the very moment the upper Colorado River project might be authorized without Echo Park Dam, the project's proponents would start their program of nibbling to get it back.

"If they did not succeed in restoring it in conference, time would build continuously stronger arguments for their cause.

"You can almost hear them saying: Billions of the taxpayers' money have been spent to build the upper Colorado project. The only way to get the money back is to build Echo Park Dam. Give us the pistons for our engine. That is the only way we can make it work financially.

"I suggest to my colleagues and to all others who are opposed to Echo Park Dam, either for reasons of economics or conservation, that its removal from the bill under present conditions would be nothing more than a subterfuge to secure its ultimate approval by Congress.

"To stop the building of Echo Park Dam it is necessary to kill the entire upper Colorado River project."

I also made a statement on the same subject June 6, 1955, as follows:

AN ENGINE WITHOUT PISTONS

(News release from Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The supporters of the gigantic upper Colorado River project admit that in its present form it is "an engine without pistons."

Yet they are asking Congress to pass this incredible bill, and force the Nation's taxpayers to suffer a loss of more than \$4 billion.

The "pistons" of the upper Colorado project was Echo Park Dam. Conservationists throughout the country fought Echo Park Dam because it would flood a part of Dinosaur National Monument.

Facing certain defeat, the bill's supporters finally informed the conservationists that Echo Park Dam would be taken out. The conservationists accepted this promise and withdrew their opposition.

It is apparent from the record that the conservationists have walked into a trap.

The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, and numerous individuals have testified repeatedly that Echo Park Dam is absolutely vital to the feasibility of the upper Colorado River project.

For instance, on January 18, 1954, Under Secretary of Interior Ralph A. Tudor, testified before the House Interior Committee as follows:

"Mr. Tudor. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, yes, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of the automobile, then?

"Mr. Tudor. I might say it might be like taking the pistons out. We feel definitely

that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted."

There is nothing in the world to prevent Congress from returning Echo Park Dam to the bill. If the bill can be passed without its pistons, obviously it will not work, and the pistons will have to be put into the engine.

By withdrawing their opposition to the bill, the conservationists are permitting themselves to be deceived. They are being lulled to sleep, and they will wake up some morning to find that Echo Park Dam is to be built in Dinosaur National Monument.

The record before Congress is replete with unqualified statements by Reclamation Bureau officials and others that Echo Park must be in the project or the project will not work, cannot pay out, and would fail to provide the development desired.

Here are excerpts from that record:

Mr. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior: "1. With respect to the need for the Echo Park Reservoir, our recommendations remain unchanged. We still recommend the construction of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir."

Mrs. Frost: "2. In your opinion, are there other sites that would be as beneficial to the project as Echo Park?

Mr. Aandahl: "No; I think Echo Park is way out ahead"

Mrs. Frost: "There is no other substitute?"

Mr. Aandahl: "It is way out ahead of alternatives that might be proposed."

Mr. W. A. Drexelmer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation: "3. The proposed use of the canyon sections of the Dinosaur National Monument for water and power developments was contemplated long before the original 80-acre area was enlarged to its present size of over 200,000 acres in 1938. A number of powersite withdrawals prior to that year are evidence of this fact. Recognition of the importance of these potential power developments was given in the President's proclamation enlarging the 80-acre monument. The supervision of the area by the National Park Service under this proclamation was not to affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and administration of the monument was subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

"The plan before you for coordinating the development of the water and power resources of Green and Yampa River Canyons along with their scenic and recreation values is therefore consistent with the language and spirit of the proclamation. The Department has no doubts as to the appropriateness of creating an artificial lake and adjoining facilities within the bounds of this particular national monument. It would not create a precedent for invasion of other parks. The precedent, if any, was created in 1938 when the boundaries were extended to the canyon areas with a clear understanding that water conservation and power development had prior right to the use of those areas."

Mrs. Frost: "4. Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project?"

Mr. Drexelmer: "Yes. Although, by elimination of parts of the project, the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin."

Mr. Drexelmer: "5. It (Echo Park) is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units

in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan."

Mr. E. O. Larson, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation: "6. Here are the principal advantages of including Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado storage project plan:

"1. With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

"2. Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored in Echo Park would be less than any other major storage site in the upper basin.

"3. Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 200,000 acre-feet of evaporation losses annually, a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

"4. Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating the flows of the rivers, that is, when they are constructed. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at Split Mountain and Gray Canyon sites downstream on the Green River. This is why Under Secretary Tudor mentioned that Echo Park was the wheelhorse in the upper basin.

"5. The use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economical development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to upstream power markets of the proposed system of dams and powerplants and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer, chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many other important minerals."

Mr. Sisk: "7. Could I ask you this question, Mr. Merriell: Do you feel that Echo Park represents a more important feature of this project, let us say, than Glen Canyon, assuming that only a portion of the project could be built?"

Mr. Frank C. Merriell, chief engineer of the Colorado River Water Conservation District: "In some ways it does. In the first place, where this project will sell power, the first places are in the vicinity of Salt Lake and of Denver, and the most direct transmission that can be devised in the project is from Echo Park to each of those places. Now, that is the principal reason, and there are other collateral reasons. There is a possibility of a very great industrial use right close to Echo Park in the phosphate beds of the Uinta Mountains, and other possibilities in the Uinta Mountains, in the Grand Valley, in industrial use, whereas Glen Canyon is a long way from there."

Brian H. Stringham, Vernal, Utah: "8. Opponents of the project, most of whom are well intentioned citizens, base their chief argument on the false premise that the building of Echo Park Dam within the Dinosaur National Monument will set a precedent for the commercial invasion of all parks and monuments. This argument is not based on facts as the following official documents will show. These instruments also prove that it was definitely understood by officials and the people at the time the monument was enlarged that power and reclamation projects were to be constructed inside the monument at some future time, and that the area would be subject to several other existing rights.

"On June 10, 1920, the Federal Water Power Act was passed creating the Federal Power Commission. This Commission was given authority to grant licenses to construct dams in national monuments according to the opinion given by Councilor Abbott representing the House Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation. However, on March 3, 1921,

the Congress amended the Federal Water Power Act taking from the Power Commission and giving to the Congress authority to grant licenses to construct dams within parks and monuments, but in doing so, the Congress added these significant amendments: 'As now constituted or existing.' Thus leaving the authority in the Federal Power Commission to grant licenses for construction of power dams in newly created monuments such as Dinosaur. President Roosevelt recognized this fact in his proclamation enlarging the monument."

Mr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of interstate streams for Utah: 9. "Mr. Chairman, I think the Echo Park Dam is absolutely necessary to this project. The Echo Park Dam, in my opinion, occupies the same position that I would, for example. I am pretty good with both arms and both legs. You can cut one arm off and I can still live, and you can cut two arms off and I can still live, and you can cut both legs off and I can still live, but I am not much good. And Echo Park Dam is an essential unit in this thing because it is a basinwide project, and it must be considered in terms of the series of storage dams, their operation to provide for water for consumptive use, provide the water to meet the obligation to the lower basin, and to provide for power generation. All of those three are inextricably tied together."

Mr. Dixon: "10. You concur in his testimony that there is no substitute equal to Echo Park as a dam site."

Mr. Clyde: "Yes, sir; I am convinced in my independent analysis as well as review of many, many reports, that there is no substitute for Echo Park."

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a United States Senator from the State of Wyoming:

"11. So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States."

Milward L. Simpson, Governor of Wyoming: "12. Echo and Glen Canyon Dams are vital elements in the development of the upper basin States."

H. T. Person, dean of engineering, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.: "13. In regard to Echo Park Reservoir—this unit is one of the very important units in the team of storage units necessary for the fullest development of the water resources of the upper basin. Its strategic location below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, its low evaporation losses and its contribution to maximum power production makes it an essential unit in the upper basin development. The grandeur, the spiritual and esthetic values of the canyons of the Echo Dam site are acknowledged. The Echo Park Reservoir will not destroy these values. Echo Park will eliminate some sections of river rapids—but there are hundreds of miles of river rapids in the vast areas of the upper Colorado River basin. Echo Park Reservoir will make the recreational values of this vast area available to hundreds of thousands of people every year—rather than to just those few hundred daredevil river runners who now have that opportunity. Echo Park Reservoir is in the Dinosaur National Monument. However, the evidence is documentary and clear, that the people of the area were given assurance in 1938 when Dinosaur Monument was extended to include the Echo Park area, that establishment of the extensive monument would not interfere with the use of the area for grazing, or with the development of the water resources of the area."

G. E. Untermann, director, Utah Field House of Natural History, Vernal, Utah: "14.

Much of the opposition of rabid conservation groups to a proposed dam in Dinosaur National Monument is baseless and unrealistic."

Herbert F. Smart, Salt Lake City, Utah: "15. Conservationists opposed to the construction of this dam say there is a principle involved. Yet actually the only principle involved is one of the integrity of the Government and the people, including conservationists, in keeping promises and assurances, and abiding by conditions incident to the enlargement of the Dinosaur National Monument. The question of the inviolability of a national monument is not at issue here. The question of the inviolability of promises incident to the enlargement of the boundaries is involved. The integrity of our national park system is predicated upon good faith, and conservationists interested in preserving the inviolability of our national park system should be the first to recognize and, in good faith, insist upon compliance with the conditions under which the Dinosaur Monument boundaries were extended, namely, subject to power and reclamation withdrawals.

"To many of us who have been a part of the conservation movement in the West, we are at a loss to understand the motives of conservationists opposing a project which will result in such a material gain to conservation objectives and principles. In the best tradition of Gifford Pinchot, the passage of the Colorado River storage project will mean the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest period of time."

Angus McDonald, legislative assistant, National Farmers Union: 16. Sites other than those recommended by the Department of Interior have been suggested because it was contended that the building of a dam at the Echo Park site would be an invasion of the national park system and would forever mar the natural beauty of the area. The record will show that the original monument created by President Wilson consisted of 80 acres which would not include Echo Park and when President Roosevelt expanded the monument by Executive Order in 1938, that he provided that expansion of the monument should not bar the building of power projects. In other words, the Echo Park site has never been part of the national park system. The mere fact that it was called a park did not make it a national park. It is also contended that development of the water resources of the upper Colorado and the Echo Park site would impair it as a recreational center and that in some way it would disrupt the Dinosaur Monument. Geography indicates that the bones of the dinosaurs, if any, would not be disturbed because the dinosaur graveyard is down the river from the Echo Park site. Impounding water behind the Echo Park would not submerge a single dinosaur bone. On the contrary the proponents of the project tell us that the creation of a huge lake behind the Echo Park would enhance the recreational opportunities and that roads would be built into the area so that many more thousands of people could enjoy recreational activities, whereas at the present time, the area is relatively inaccessible."

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, a United States Senator from the State of Utah: "17. This puts the shoe on the other foot. It is not a national monument that is being invaded—it is a matter of some misled or misinformed conservationists who are trying to urge that Uncle Sam violate his integrity and treat as mere scraps of paper solemn reservations in the public interest in the Dinosaur Monument area that precede the limited monument proclamation by 17 to 34 years. It ill-behoves honest conservationists to take such an untenable position, because we who love our parks and monuments should strive to preserve as honorable and legal commitments the reservations of

public lands for such a noble and worthy use as parks and monuments. Therefore, how can we, in the same breath, ask that equally binding and legal reservations for water development, be invaded, especially when the monument proclamation itself recognizes and exempts from the Dinosaur Monument land reservation these previous withdrawals for water resource development?"

REFERENCE INDEX TO QUOTED STATEMENTS

Colorado River storage project: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session on H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3383, H. R. 3384, and H. R. 4488 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

PART I		
Name	Date	Page
1. Aandahl, Hon. Fred G.-----	Mar. 9, 1955	32
2. Aandahl, Hon. Fred G.-----	do	33
3. Dexheimer, W. A.-----	do	51
4. Dexheimer, W. A.-----	do	174
5. Dexheimer, W. A.-----	Mar. 10, 1955	193
6. Larson, E. O.-----	do	193-194
PART II		
Name	Date	Page
7. Merriell, Frank C.-----	Mar. 11, 1955	471
8. Stringham, Briant H.-----	Mar. 14, 1955	551-552
9. Clyde, George D.-----	do	559
10. Clyde, George D.-----	do	571
11. O'Mahoney, Hon. Joseph C.-----	Mar. 16, 1955	615
12. Simpson, Milward L.-----	do	619
13. Person, H. T.-----	do	623
14. Untermann, G. E.-----	do	650
15. Smart, Herbert F.-----	do	683-684
16. McDonald, Angus-----	do	703
17. Watkins, Hon. Arthur V.-----	do	706

Now, true or false, what I say about Echo Park still being in the bill. If you do not put it in they are going to have to come back and ask for it later. The project is not going to be financially feasible without it, so if the project is not financially feasible without Echo it certainly must still be in it, sooner or later, so the issue is actually before the Congress of the United States now, whether we like it or not.

I reiterate what I said in that regard by quoting the same newspaper that wrote the editorial about me. Last year when the Echo Park Dam was taken out of the project by the House they said:

It has long been a part of the upper basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope it will be restored.

I do not think it will be restored by the other body, during conference this year, if we pass the bill, but I do believe it will be restored as time goes on and it becomes obvious that the project cannot work without it.

I want you now to determine whether or not this is true or false: I have said that the assistance to the Navahos in the bill is negligible. I think that even the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will agree with me on that, because he said that was true when the bill was being discussed by the Republican policy committee. The bill would only build a Navaho dam and reservoir. It would be nothing more than a piece of concrete

in the middle of a river, and when built it would be an item to point out and say, "Now, give us the money to do the rest of the job."

What is the rest of the job? The rest of the job is to build the project down to the Navaho Indians, which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs admitted would cost \$200,000 each for 1,100 Indian farms.

The assistance to Navaho Indians in the bill is negligible; cost of project's benefits is \$200,000 for each and every Navaho farm: the assistance to the Navaho Indians in the bill would be negligible without the addition of the costly Navaho reclamation project.

The bill would authorize the Navaho Dam and Reservoir only and this does not irrigate any Navaho lands. The water stored in the reservoir could not be used for irrigation of Indian lands unless and until canals and other facilities of an additional reclamation project are authorized and built, involving a construction cost of \$175 million or more.

According to testimony presented at the hearings, the Indian Bureau contemplates that the additional reclamation project would provide for 1,100 Navaho Indian family farms. The cost per family farm would be about \$200,000. Indian Bureau witnesses estimate the gross income per family farm would be \$5,000 a year. In comparison, it should be noted that the \$200,000 of capital proposed to be expended per family farm would, if invested at 5 percent interest, yield an income of twice the estimated gross farm income.

In view of these facts, consideration might well be given to some different program for use of Federal funds to rehabilitate the Navaho Indians that would be more beneficial to them and more practicable and effective from the standpoint of the Federal Government than the costly irrigation project as proposed. In this connection, the record indicates that it is not certain that the Navaho Indians either want to farm irrigated lands, or would succeed as irrigation farmers.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I will not yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman is taking this time as a subterfuge to discuss the bill. When he asked us to determine whether something was true or false I asked him to yield so I could show him it was false, and he declined to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that the gentleman has for the last few minutes been proceeding in order. The gentleman is recognized to proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the Speaker.

I want to return now to a matter that I asked you to determine in your own minds whether my statement is true or false, and that was the statement that I made that this piece of legislation would take away water to which California has existing rights by contract, by compact, and by appropriation. True or false?

A football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the upper Colorado Basin storage project is built as now planned.

Imagine a canal wide enough and deep enough to float the world's biggest ship, the Navy's new aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Imagine that canal stretching from New York City to Los Angeles. During just one year, enough of the Colorado River's water to fill it could be stopped from flowing downstream at the project's gigantic Glen Canyon Dam.

That is water that could not be used by southern California, Arizona, and Nevada because it would be withheld upstream in violation of the Colorado River compact and never reach them.

All this is true because the overall multi-billion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper-basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower-basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that her share of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these 7 States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the storage project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these existing rights, California carefully invested between one-half and three-quarter billion dollars of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to an-

other part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

That is why Californians in Congress are fighting so hard to prevent spending billions from the United States Treasury to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

The reason they have failed so far to do it is clear. To find a common ground for agreement amongst themselves, each of the upper-basin States had to accept every project, good, bad, or indifferent, any of the others asked for. They ended up with a monstrosity that did not fit the interpretations and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Rather than recede, they adopted a technique of twisting, straining, and distorting the compact in an attempt to stretch it over the monstrous package to which they have affixed the euphonious label, upper Colorado River storage project.

The reason they have adopted this technique is not so clear. To understand it requires some knowledge of the Colorado River compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California already had begun its miraculous expansion in population, agriculture, and industry. A water shortage was faced, and Los Angeles began reaching up into the Owens Valley for water to be transported through an aqueduct over 100 miles long. Even then, men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the Owens Valley and began talk of more ambitious plans. Plans which one day would result in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the metropolitan water district's vast Colorado River aqueduct, with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

Meanwhile, the upper-basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States foresaw burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves.

In this circumstance, according to the language of Delph Carpenter, Colorado's negotiator of the compact:

The upper States had but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower States until the uses within the upper States have reached their maximum.

And that exactly is what they did. The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizing Hoover Dam was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by them; and

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

The net effect was to place on California a limit of slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water per year that she could use. Thus limited, the State had to jettison many desirable projects. Nevertheless, California went to work and tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of the great dreamed of projects built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificence to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. For what purpose does the gentleman ask me to yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. For the purpose of restating the position which the gentleman says the Governor of Colorado took.

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield at this time. If I have a little time later on, I will yield.

The upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in the so-called upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

Placed in the best light, according to Government experts, they would cost about \$300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period.

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 participating projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

As a consequence the proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent of the price tag within the time limit. They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true cash register nature.

As a starter two power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon and one

at Fleming; another, conditionally at Curecanti. Other power projects would follow later.

The Glen Canyon and other power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The latter could function to supply water entirely without them. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about \$500 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the \$300 million participating projects' cost.

It is little wonder that alert citizens throughout the Nation, concerned over the Federal debt and high taxes, have voiced opposition to the scheme. Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11 participating projects to the upper basin States and forgets the power features completely.

It is with these power features that Californians have also a special concern. They would hold back, for power use, most of the 48 million acre-feet of water to be stored by the project. In the storage process, another 10 million acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation. Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects.

That is mostly water that thirsty southern Californians claim they are entitled to have flow downstream to their State and which cannot legally be withheld from them because of their prior right to it established by contract, appropriation, and the Colorado River compact.

The Colorado River compact was negotiated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover, then winding up his affairs as World War I Food Administrator for starving Europe, acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First, the upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah;

Second, the lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada; and

Third, that part of the River which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in northernmost Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon the negotiators proceeded to apportion beneficial consumptive use of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to

use of water for irrigation, industrial, or domestic purposes.

That kind of use of water in the amount of 7½ million acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin by the compact's article III (a). This totals 15 million acre-feet, and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, by article III (b) they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of surplus water.

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they wrote article III (c) saying Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This, again, was to come out of surplus, but if need be, equally out of each basin's III (a) apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1½ million acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17½ million acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river so in article III (f) they set up machinery for "a further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river, in fact, averages a critical deficiency of almost 2½ million acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one-party suicide pact California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt, by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water. Illustrative is the dispute involving article III (d).

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower basin negotiator insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. This turned up as article III (d) prohibiting the upper basin from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

They persist in this contention even in the face of an interpretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively

used in the upper States for agricultural purposes.

In the past, California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

That the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project would eulchre California out of vast quantities of Colorado River water to which she is legally entitled should be well known and understood.

An additional specific objection to the project must not be ignored by Congress:

It threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalis and salts before use in homes and factories. Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject. Based on it they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

The reasons why southern California's water quality would suffer are simple: First, water returning to the river after new upstream irrigation uses would contain added impurities dissolved from the soil. Second, pure upstream water diverted in large amounts through mountains and out of the river system forever would not be available to dilute concentrated impurities further downstream. Third, water withheld in upstream storage reservoirs would likewise be for dilution purposes.

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre. Just how long soil could continue growing crops in face of this is speculative.

The effect would be similar in home and industrial water systems, to say nothing of the already irritated digestive tracts of almost 6 million southern Californians.

At the same time, and for the remaining life of the power contracts at Hoover Dam—until 1987—the Federal Government, and thus the United States taxpayers, would lose a total of \$187 million in revenue from power not sold because there was no water to generate it.

This \$187 million loss to taxpayers illustrates that there are substantial reasons not to build the upper Colorado River storage project in addition to those local to California. These reasons, shared by the citizens of all the 48 States, are varied and compelling.

Many people throughout the country find the project objectionable because Echo Park, one of the major power features of the overall development, lies in the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. They point out that a precedent would be set for the invasion of any and all national parks and monuments by unsightly power facilities in disregard of the trust imposed on each generation of Americans to preserve these public shrines unviolated for future generations.

Naturalists also point to the possible destruction of, or at least damage to, Utah's famed Rainbow Natural Bridge during construction and operations at the Glen Canyon power site.

In their turn, taxpayers groups and economists attack the project's effect on Federal finances from several fronts.

Raymond Moley, one of ex-President Roosevelt's brain trust, has stated that by the time compound interest for 50 to 100 years is paid on the \$1 billion the United States must borrow to construct the project, costs will run to not less than \$4 billion. Even simple interest at 2½ percent amounts in 10 years to 25 percent of the money borrowed; in 40 years to 100 percent; and in 80 years to 200 percent.

Moley's figures indicate the total cost would amount to more than \$5,000 per irrigated acre. So poor is most of the land, located as it is at high elevations where growing seasons are short, that even after irrigation its value will average only about \$150 an acre.

In all, about 600 square miles would be irrigated to produce surplus crops involving further losses to taxpayers when purchased under price-support programs. Even if needed, certainly there lies somewhere within the borders of the entire United States another 600 square miles of land that could be brought under cultivation at a cost significantly less than \$4 billion.

Project proponents point out that the Government can expect to recoup part of its outlay by selling electricity from power features. However, their calculations are based on selling power for 6 mills per kilowatt hour for the next 75 or more years. This anticipation is utterly unrealistic because production cost of electricity from both conventional and nuclear fuels is plummeting. With these costs at far below 6 mills in the foreseeable future, the net effect will be to leave the project's vast hydroelectric facility on the backs of Federal taxpayers as the most monumental white elephant in history.

There is a further fundamental concern pointed to by economists which

must be faced both by the Nation and the people living in the upper basin who are even more directly involved. It is that the region is unbelievably rich in natural resources: coal, oil, natural gas, oil shale, uranium, gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, molybdenum, vanadium, phosphate, and many other minerals.

The resources utilized toward development of an unlimited industrial economy, not a limited farm economy, are the real keys to the area's future and to its full contribution to the American way of life.

Water resources in the area are of measurable quantity and their potential benefits in an agricultural economy not great. On the other hand, the benefits which they can bring in a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable.

Should not this region, and must not the Nation, insist that the course of development be pursued which is to the greatest good of all?

It is clear that Californians must oppose the upper basin storage project to protect the quantity and quality of their Colorado River water supply and to protect an important source of their electric power.

It is equally clear that all other Americans should join in this opposition for protection of the Nation's finances and in pursuance of a sound national policy to develop each part of our homeland to its own, and to the country's highest good.

The whole upper Colorado project must be revamped to the end that it ultimately will produce results instead of merely consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend in my remarks additional material and try, as I was not able to do today, to place these remarks in a more orderly fashion, but in stating them and in reading them I will say what I have said, and I will say why I have said what I have said, and I will leave it up to you as to whether my statements are true or false.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has not had permission to extend his remarks, and I am rather prone to object to his extending his remarks unless he has already obtained it.

Mr. HOSMER. I have already obtained that permission.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is material he desires to place in the RECORD that has not been spoken in his presentation of the question of personal privilege explaining the position he has taken. It would seem that the Members of the House ought to have the right to know something about the extent of it.

Mr. HOSMER. I will be glad to tell the gentleman what I am going to put in by way of extension. The only reason I am not talking about it now, of course, is that my time has almost expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does it represent the pile of papers the gentleman has before him on the desk?

Mr. HOSMER. I will include many of the things in these papers before me.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has it already been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HOSMER. No; if the gentleman will permit I will tell him what some of this material I have here is, or so much as time allows.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HOSMER. I am going to put in further material as to the costliness of this project, material further substantiating the statement I have made in that regard.

I am going to put in substantiating material showing that the cost estimated by the Bureau backstopped by the statement in the appropriation authorization in the bill of only \$760 million is misleading.

I am going to put in a table showing the distribution of costs amongst the 48 States, and also as to the true cost of the tremendous interest that will have to be paid.

I am going to extend and show why I have said that the huge hidden subsidy to these four States is unwarranted and unconscionable.

I am going to put in additional material to prove my allegation that the project is not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am going to put in additional material to back-stop my allegation that the financial scheme of the project is wholly unsound, that the project payment provisions are unrealistic, uneconomical, and unfeasible.

I am going to extend additional material with respect to the impossibility of selling power at 6 mills for the next 100 years.

I am going to put in additional material to show why I make the statement that the dams are nothing but subsidized irrigation projects and are not for power.

I am going to put in a rather full discussion of the statement that low-cost nuclear electric power development potentialities have been disregarded and neglected in connection with this piece of legislation; and in that connection I am going to quote W. Kenneth Davis, the Director of the Division of Reactor Development of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, who in the presentation to the United Nations 10th anniversary celebration in San Francisco last June stated that the most important point in considering this question is that we have a changed situation in the matter of power development; that any answer which may be given today will almost surely be changed because of the rapid progress that is being made in this new field. This is Mr. Davis' statement:

EXTRACT FROM REMARKS PREPARED BY W. KENNETH DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF REACTOR DEVELOPMENTS, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, FOR PRESENTATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS 10TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE WEEK ACTIVITIES SYMPOSIUM ON ATOMIC PEACE—HORIZON OF HOPE, JUNE 24, 1955, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Where do we stand today in the technical development of nuclear power for the generation of electricity or for other power uses?

A most important point in considering this question is the rapid change of the sit-

uation with time. An answer which can be given today will almost surely be out of date a year or two from now because of the rapid progress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker—
The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Mexico rise?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the point of order that the gentleman now clearly shows that he is proposing to put in the RECORD not matter on the question of personal privilege, but merely debate on this bill, and that he is taking advantage of the Committee by subterfuge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is answering a question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska. Whether or not he puts it in is a matter for the House to determine. His having already obtained consent to his request it is a matter for the gentleman as a Member to consider.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, a further point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's request was to extend his remarks dealing with the substance of his discussion of the question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California is now offering to put in the RECORD things that are entirely not in order but which constitute debate on the bill. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has already obtained permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, the Chair assumes the gentleman is not going to trespass upon the judgment or the conscience of any other Member.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said the project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential. True or false. Here are the facts:

The region in which the project would be constructed is unbelievably rich in natural resources. These are the measures of its future potential.

The water resources of the area are of measurable quantity, and their potential benefits to agriculture would be small. On the other hand, the benefits which these limited water supplies could bring to a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable and of unlimited value.

Irrigation is a very uneconomic user of water. The value of crops grown under western irrigation is equal to about 10 cents for each 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn. The value of manufactured products amount to about \$5 for each 1,000 gallons withdrawn.

The potential thermal power resources of the project area are beyond comprehension. In the heart of this land, the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing a horse-and-buggy economy that would cripple forever opportunities to create a profitable and unlimited industrial economy.

Steam or nuclear plants to provide electrical energy in these States could be

built by private capital, with no Federal subsidy involved. They would create new employment in the coalfields and in the industries that would build to take advantage of the available power. Thus a sound stone would be placed in the area's economy by each plant and each job created, and the plants, the new industries, and those employed by them, would pay taxes to the local, State, and Federal Governments.

Agricultural development will seriously injure, if not kill, all opportunities to build such a sound economy. There is only so much water, and the most wasteful way to use it would be by subsidizing unneeded, extravagant, and wasteful irrigation projects. The hope of the area lies in a modern-age industrial program, not a surplus-ridden farm economy.

I have said the benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics. True or false? Here are the facts:

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects, which are both economically and financially infeasible; first, by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits; while, second, at the same time overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1: on one participating project—the Hammond—the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only \$2.02 per acre per year, but says the direct benefits are \$41.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2: The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time—which may be as long as 25 years—the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskaadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find \$638,500 of indirect benefits and \$313,100 of public benefits to add to the finding of \$614,500 in direct benefits—all items over a 100-year period—to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The indirect benefits category includes such nebulous factors as the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers, while the public benefits category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau

guesses as to the increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy.

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

I call particular attention to what has been said about this cost-benefit ratio by Adm. Ben Moreell as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, NATIONAL WATER POLICY CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, 1956

A third area of divergence covers the requirements and criteria for determining economic justification and financial feasibility of projects, including the kinds of benefits and costs to be considered. Under present law, economic criteria are few and indefinitely described. There are no definitions of "benefits" and the interpretation of what constitutes "costs" varies from agency to agency. The Bureau of Reclamation, for example, has even prescribed a factor to apply to attendance at the movies as a measure of project benefits. Such painful efforts to justify projects of dubious worth give rise to the suspicion that there has developed in this country a conviction that the expenditure of Federal funds to promote the interests of a particular area, or of a particular group, is warranted provided it can be shown that the probable resulting benefits to that area or groups may exceed the out-of-pocket costs which are paid for by the general taxpayers. It is almost traditional that benefits are overestimated and costs under estimated. The question whether this is the best expenditure of Federal funds in the interest of all of the people of the Nation, who pay the bill, has been given little consideration.

I have said that 50 years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project. True or false? Here are the facts:

Example 1: Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill: (a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years; (b) the municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit; (c) the irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law. Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Example 2: Present law requires that no contract relating to power or municipal water be made unless it will not impair the project for irrigation purposes. Under the bill, contracts relating to municipal water may be made without regard to this section. Although this may not be a bad result, it is another symptom of eroding the reclamation law by individual pieces of legislation instead of considering such matters in the context of a national water policy bill.

Example 3: Present law requires interest at "not less than" 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under

this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

Example 4: Present law requires a finding of engineering and financial feasibility, the latter to be in terms of the 40-year repayment ability. Under this bill, the so-called benefit-cost ratio has been substituted for financial feasibility in order to come up with an economic feasibility based on fantastic national benefits supposedly to be realized. This constitutes one of the greatest breaches of present law and leaves Congress with no well-defined standards of feasibility whatsoever.

I have said the project wholly ignores the Hoover Commission report. True or false? Here are the facts:

The Hoover Commission report has just been released. The bill ignores any of the counsel to be gained from the labors of the Commission, which has completed a detailed study of this entire complex field. In fact, the proponents of this gigantic scheme tried to get it through Congress before the Hoover Commission made its report, so blind have they been to the true national welfare in connection with water resources.

However, one may disagree with some of the recommendations of the Commission and the task force, your minority submits that the members of this group should be heard before Congress commits itself to the billion-dollar precedents of this bill. It should not be forgotten that this Commission was established by Congress to report to Congress so that Congress might consider the advisability of legislation to implement some if not all of the Commission recommendations. Regardless of the jeers heard from spokesmen for special interests, your minority considers that the people of this country respect the industry and the sincerity of the Hoover Commission inquiries.

Your minority believes that the people are entitled to and will demand a thorough consideration of the Commission reports in every field. For example, in the water-resources field, the Commission report relates five conditions which the task force found to be necessary for the success of reclamation projects:

First. They must have technical feasibility.

Second. They must be sound financially.

Third. They must have fertile soil capable of agricultural production over long periods of years.

Fourth. They must have adequate and suitable water supply.

Fifth. There must be farmers available who are interested in and enthusiastic for irrigation agriculture.

Relating these to the project before Congress, the record shows there is question as to the technical feasibility of the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam; the financing is wholly unsound; the soil by and large is of dubious quality; and the water supply is actively in litigation in the Supreme Court.

The Commission further found experience shows that the farmers alone cannot bear the whole cost of irrigation projects. Conceding this, would it not

be a proper inquiry for Congress to determine what the farmers should pay? Should they pay only 12 percent, as this bill allows? If so, who should bear the balance of the cost, local area residents or the taxpayer in every corner of this Nation?

The Hoover Commission makes a pertinent suggestion on this score—that the beneficiaries—including States—contribute at least 50 percent—which may well be forgotten if the hydroheaded monster now before Congress becomes law.

I have said the project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering, and financial survey prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete. True or false? Here are the facts:

The official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of Bureau witnesses clearly show that the investigations, surveys, and studies in regard to engineering and the economic and financial aspects of the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects are incomplete and inadequate.

The provisions of the Senate bill itself, which require further studies and report by the Secretary of the Interior on economic feasibility and financial reimbursability of the 11 participating projects previously recommended by the Secretary, demonstrate that reliable information is not now available even on those projects that the Bureau has already reported on. The House bill seeks to cover up this deficiency even in the face of the clear recommendation of the administration that these projects be re-evaluated before authorization.

The Senate bill with which the House bill might go to conference includes authorization of scores of projects on which no reports have as yet been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, on many of which only the barest reconnaissance data are now available.

The record reveals the need for much more thorough investigations and studies of the proposed storage units. Even as to the Glen Canyon storage unit, the Interior Department officials have expressed concern over the adequacy of the foundations and have stated that decisions as to final plans would not be made until further studies are completed after authorization. Plans for the other storage dams are even less decisive. Thus there is grave question as to the adequacy of cost estimates and the financial feasibility of the storage features of the project.

In addition, it is clear from the record of the hearings that the proposed storage units of the project will not supply any water to the reclamation components now proposed and are not needed to enable these projects to obtain and use the amount of water estimated by the Bureau to be required. Yet under the House bill, it is proposed to spend about \$600 million, and under the Senate bill about \$750 million, for storage units that are not to be needed to meet basic water-supply requirements for at least 25 years and probably more.

In view of the foregoing, action on the project at this time would be premature and without justification.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Andrews	Hays, Ark.	Priest
Barrett	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Bell	Hyde	Rabaut
Bolling	James	Rains
Boykin	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Kee	Reed
Bush	Kilburn	St. George
Carrigg	King, Pa.	Shelley
Celler	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	McDowell	Tellefson
Dondero	Macdonald	Van Zandt
Eberharter	Machrowicz	Vursell
Fountain	Merrow	Wharton
Fulton	Mollohan	Williams, Miss.
Gamble	Morgan	Young
Garmatz	Mumma	Zelenko
Gavin	Osmers	
Harris	Powell	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and seventy-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to take a moment to thank the Members of the House who have by and large received my remarks with very great courtesy and attention. I know they realize it is an extremely difficult thing when every statement one has made upon a particular issue over the past several years has been challenged, how difficult it is to cover it as it should be covered; nevertheless, I much appreciate their courtesy in listening to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the pending bill and this project, I regret to find myself in disagreement with some of my friends from southern California. If I thought that this project would cost California one bucketful of water to which California is entitled from the Colorado River system, I would not be for this bill. Last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD to the extent of some 8,000 words my analysis of the legal situation with reference to the water rights of California on the Colorado, and because I regard that matter as a sectional matter and one which we Californians ought to settle among ourselves—but which unfortunately we have not been able to settle among ourselves—I do not intend to take the time of the committee or of the House in dealing with that particular aspect of the case.

I may say before I start my discussion that we have tried to divide the time in this debate fairly. The gentleman from Nebraska, the ranking Republican member of our committee and former chairman of the committee, is supporting this bill, as is the gentleman from Colorado, who is handling the time on the Democratic side. The gentleman from Nebraska has, as I understand, agreed to yield approximately one-half of his time to those who want to speak in opposition and the gentleman from Colorado has taken the same position. As a consequence, we are somewhat limited with reference to time because this is a long, difficult, and complicated matter.

I want to devote my time to giving to you the legislative history of this project, comment upon the economics of the project which have been challenged and make some reference to the relationship of this project to the farm surplus problem. If I can get over those 3 items briefly in the next 15 minutes and have some time left, I will be delighted to yield to Members on the floor. If not, perhaps at some later time if inquiry is made I will be glad to answer them.

I want to go into the legislative history to some extent because I know it is not possible for every Member of this House to be an expert on every piece of legislation that comes before it. You simply have not the time, any more than I do, to study the whole record on each bill. You have to take someone's judgment for what is right with reference to some of these bills. So it is important to me, I know, when I sit out here as a Member of the House and listen as a juror to those who are acting as advocates of particular legislation to be informed as to who has passed on the legislation and who have found it to be sound and who have found it to be unsound. Therefore, I want to run through this very briefly for the purpose of demonstrating to you that every executive agency that has examined this project has approved it and every time this project has appeared

before a legislative body of this Congress it has passed.

A report on the Colorado River storage project was completed and the project was approved by the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation on December 15, 1950. That was during a Democratic administration. The project was approved by the former Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Michael W. Straus, on December 22, 1950, and by the Secretary of the Interior on January 26, 1951. That Secretary of the Interior was a Democratic Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Oscar Chapman. It was approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Dexter, on November 13, 1953, in a Republican administration and by Secretary McKay on December 10, 1953. Therefore it is correct to say that this legislation has had the bipartisan approval of the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation under the command of the Democrats when they were in power, and since then under the command of the Republicans. This is not a Republican project in any sense of the word. This project was initiated back in 1936 under a study which continued until the first report was submitted in 1950.

Now, in response to an official request by the Secretary of the Interior for the views and recommendations of the States affected, Wyoming approved the project in March 1951 and again in December 1953. The reason each State approved it twice is because when the Democratic Secretary of the Interior got the report he sent it to all the States. When the Republican Secretary of the Interior got into office, he sent it to all the States. As a consequence Wyoming approved it twice. Utah approved it twice. New Mexico approved it twice. Arizona approved the project in June 1951 and again in January 1954, and Nevada approved the project in November 1951. The State of California approved the project on June 14, 1951, but on February 15, 1954, restricted its approval to the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir and the principal features of the project.

The Federal Power Commission approved the project on February 26, 1954. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved the project on April 5, 1954. The Department of Agriculture approved the project on March 23, 1954. The Corps of Engineers approved the project on February 4, 1954. The Bureau of the Budget, which is supposed to be the sharpest outfit around here with a pencil, especially under a Republican administration, approved the project on March 18, 1954, and the President approved the project and issued a statement thereon on March 20, 1954.

Now, I emphasize these executive approvals because they indicate that probably as many as 1,000 top men who are experts in the water and power field have given examination to this project and not one single one of those agencies has ever disapproved it. If this project is as far out of line and as fantastic as some people would try to make you believe, then I say there are a lot of men in the executive branch of the Govern-

ment, both in this administration and in the past, who ought to have their heads examined.

In addition to that, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favorably reported this bill by a vote in the last session of 11 to 1, and the Senate itself in April of 1955 passed the project 58 to 23. You have already heard that our committee approved this project by a vote of 20 to 6. In other words, this project has on three occasions gone before legislative bodies of this Congress, and in one instance carried by 11 to 1, in another instance carried by more than 2 to 1, and before our own committee carried by better than 3 to 1. So this project has been approved every time it has been put to the test. Now, I grant that it is not possible for all of you to make the careful analysis of this legislation that these people have in the executive branch of the Government and those who serve upon these committees, but I think I should say this, that whenever you get that kind of favorable reaction to legislation by those who have studied it, then you have a right to say that you can place some confidence in the correctness of that judgment. I know you are not going to dig through the deluge and the barrage of contradictory statements in regard to the facts with reference to this legislation, but here are the men, the agencies, and the legislative bodies that have approved what we are saying are the facts with reference to this legislation. The President of the United States, on so many occasions that I will not mention them all, has urged this legislation.

We have a little different bill before you than the one which was voted out by the Senate. The Senate bill was a great deal larger. Our House committee cut it in half for all practical purposes. Their bill was \$1,658,000,000. As I said, it passed the Senate by a vote of better than 2 to 1 even in that shape. We cut it in half. We took out the controversial Echo Park feature and thereby secured the support of many of the conservation people throughout the country.

We have adopted some amendments since this bill was voted out of our committee in the last session and approved by the Committee on Rules for consideration on the floor. The amendments all fall within and are consistent with the repayment plan proposed in H. R. 3383 as initially reported.

Essentially, these amendments do two things. First, the amendments which have been added make the legislation acceptable, as I have said, to the conservation groups and as indicated in the supplemental report, all of those groups now favor the legislation. Secondly, the amendments carry out the unanimous agreement recently reached among the upper basin States relative to spelling out in greater detail the accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. That is a book-keeping matter.

That is the bill that is before you at the present time. It is the bill initially voted out as amended and brought before you as set out in the supplemental report. So, when you want to see what the bill is,

read the supplemental report which contains the bill as we voted it out with the amendments in italics. That covers the legislative history of this bill.

I have referred to the approvals which this legislation has had because I want to speak briefly of the economics of this project and its repayment. The fact is, as stated on page 12 of our committee report that in 50 years following the last power installation, the project revenues will amount to \$1,075,000,000. This will be sufficient to repay (1) the power investment with interest, and (2) the required irrigation assistance of \$246 million, and (3) leave a surplus at the end of that time of \$86 million. That is the cash money that will be in the Treasury of the United States.

These two charts which I have here give a breakdown of the figures and give the allocations to each of the elements in the project and the total revenues that will be secured. These are the charts which have been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation with the approval of the Department of the Interior. They have the approval of all of these executive agencies to which I have referred, including the Bureau of the Budget.

We will see some other figures around here, but these are the figures that have come up from downtown, in two administrations. The chart which is shown in color is one which gives a quantitative display of the cost of the project and the repayment. You will see that the repayment quantitatively is just a little more than twice the total cash cost of the project.

There is one thing, I think, I should point out to you, because I should like to say that this project is every bit as good as the Central Valley project in California so far as repayment to the Federal Government is concerned—and the Central Valley project in California is the most famous irrigation and reclamation project in the world. This project pays out just as that project does—the Federal Government gets its money back. The difference is this, that the irrigators do not pay so much. You have heard of the high cost per acre. The people in the area are going to pay that. The irrigators do not pay very much. If you look at this small red slip, that represents about 15 percent of the total cost of the irrigation works. So the irrigators do not pay very much. They pay all that they can pay, but the power users step in and pick up the rest of it. All of the money comes out of those four great States, out of their consumers, out of their resources, and out of their people.

How does it make any difference to the Federal taxpayer whether a power consumer who turns on a light helps pay back this bill or an irrigator pay it back? Let us assume that the irrigators are going to pay half of it. Under reclamation law, all we do is reduce the power rate. The power rate in this instance to carry this load has to be 6 mills. The power rate in this Nation has never gone down in all history. It does not make any difference whether the power consumer pays it, living out on his ranch, running a pump and lighting his house,

and the little communities that this project feeds and sustains, or the irrigator. In the Central Valley project the irrigators will pay back about 66 percent of the cost, and power one-third. The power rate in the Central Valley project of California is 4 mills. If these irrigators could pay more we would just reduce the power rate. In any case, the Federal Government gets its money back. It would get the money back on the power investment. It will be the investment in the power plus the interest, the investment in municipal water plus the interest, and the Federal Government will get the irrigation investment back without interest, which is traditional under 50 years of reclamation law.

I assert that this project is just as good on its economics as any of them. The people I have mentioned who have recommended this project will say to you that it is engineeringly sound, that it is economically justified, and that it is financially feasible.

In addition—and this should be pointed out—because a great deal has been said with respect to the allocation among the States, there is sufficient money now in the national reclamation fund to put up over half—55 percent—of the amount of money which will go into this project. As a matter of fact, the only money that will come out of the general revenues of the Treasury to finance this project will be less than \$18 million a year.

I have seen the tax chart sent around purporting to show the amount to be paid by each State. I wrote Mr. Dexter, the Reclamation Commissioner, and I asked him about that. This is what he said. He said that recent articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the public press contain erroneous and misleading data on proposals for authorizing additional reclamation projects.

Allegations are made that the cost of these projects would be proportionately assessed against the States of the Union according to the States tax burden. For the upper Colorado project, for instance, it is mentioned at \$4 billion.

He says these statements are not in accord with the facts. The facts are that the reclamation fund, which will be discussed later in some detail by my colleagues, is made up out of money that comes from reclamation projects, out of oil and gas lease revenues, and out of public land sales in the West, which will constitute over 55 percent of the money going into this project.

The actual assessment, Mr. Dexter states, against the average taxpayer throughout the United States will be less than \$18 million a year throughout the period of the construction of this project. That is not equal to the amount of money that will go into the power-producing features of this project. The interest-free features which, as you will see here, cost some \$287 million, will come out of the reclamation fund and will not come out of the general tax fund, will not cost the taxpayers of this Nation anything whatsoever out of the general tax revenue. On the other hand, the investment in the power features of this project will pay the Federal Government back all of the principal and the interest.

I want to say something with reference to the farm surpluses, because it is contended that there is a basic inconsistency between authorizing this project and on the other hand setting up a soil bank. I assert that delivering water to these lands will move in the direction away from those surpluses which have troubled our Treasury and our Nation. There are only two of them that will be raised of any consequence in this area. They are wheat and corn. Experience has shown that when dry land producing wheat is irrigated, the land for the most part is diverted to other crops.

Here is an example. On the Columbia basin project where 500,000 acres have been brought under irrigation to date the wheat acreage has been cut by 90 percent and the production of wheat cut by 2½ million bushels a year. As the tremendous growth in the Columbia basin increases, there will be a further reduction in the production of wheat and it is estimated that by the time the project is completed, there will be a reduction of 5 million bushels of wheat per year. In short, the irrigation of these areas leads precisely away and in the opposite direction from these supported crops, and as a consequence it is not an addition to the surpluses of this Nation. What we are creating here is a water bank and not a soil bank—a water bank for future progress, development and living in that great area.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that the legislative history of this bill shows it has been approved by every executive agency and by every legislative group which has given it a hearing up to this time. It will not add to the surpluses of this Nation. The figures show that this project is engineeringly sound, economically justified, and financially feasible. It has been approved by the finest engineers in both this administration and in the past administration. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill goes to a vote in the final test that it has here before this legislative body, the record will be made 100 percent in the approval of the upper Colorado River basin project by every executive agency and legislative body before which it has been put to a test.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has made a very fine statement of the economics of the project and its effect upon reclamation in the West and in the Nation generally. In the few minutes I have at my disposal, I wish to bring to you a picture of the physical area concerned and also a very short statement of the legislation itself. The area of the Colorado River reaches from the southern parts of Wyoming, the northern parts of Colorado and Utah to the Gulf of California. Because of differences had during the early part of this century over the use of the water and the possible future uses of the water, a compact was entered into by representatives of the seven States concerned. The compact provided that the water of the Colorado

River or rather the use of the water of the Colorado River would be divided at Lee's Ferry as far as the quotas between the two areas were concerned. Lee's Ferry is just south of the boundary between Arizona and Utah. Too, the lower basin was guaranteed the first 7½ million acre-feet of water. The upper basin was guaranteed the second half—whatever that might be, and if the water was not there, the upper basin would be the one that would be short. Also, the lower basin was allotted an extra million acre-feet of water which either rises within the bed of the river itself or rises from tributaries below Lee's Ferry. That was the Colorado compact—solemnly entered into by the States and approved by the Congress of the United States in 1923.

I can advise my colleagues without any fear of contradiction that the legislation proposed in H. R. 3383 is in compliance with the Colorado River compact and the other compacts and agreements which go to make up the "law of the river."

Already since 1930 some \$400 million of Federal moneys have been spent to develop the area south of Lee's Ferry, mostly in southern California or along the river itself. Since 1939 and 1940, moneys have been given to the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure in the upper basin to investigate, and survey, and make reports on projects which would do for the upper basin what has been done for the lower basin.

The reason the work has not proceeded faster is because the contribution from the Boulder Canyon fund is only \$500,000 a year, and the amount appropriated by Congress has not been sufficient to firm up a faster job. But as the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], has said, in 1946 the Department of the Interior filed with the Congress its first report. It filed with the Congress its second report on the Colorado River in 1947, with the statement of the various States, all of them favorable. Since that time we have been busy trying to draft legislation to bring before the Congress to start the development of resources, mostly water resources, but other developments too that necessarily go along with it in the upper basin.

The bill now before this Committee provides for 4 major units, 3 of which are power producing units and 1 of which is regulatory in streamflow only. I will name them.

The Glen Canyon Dam with which I think you are familiar. I think you are also familiar with the Flaming Gorge Dam; and may I suggest that there are those of us who still think the Echo Park site was more to be desired than Flaming Gorge, but we have been defeated in our purpose and we are willing to abide by the decision of the Committee and have taken Flaming Gorge in the northern part of Utah in place of Echo Park. While doing this we have entered into an agreement with the conservationists to the effect that we would not trespass upon any national park or national monument area in the construction of projects authorized under the provisions of this bill. I mention this because of a colloquy had during the discussion had

on the rule between the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and myself relative to the position of the Sierra Club. Since that time I have talked to Mr. Brower, the director of the club, and he has assured me within the last 20 minutes that their opposition is withdrawn provided we place and keep within this bill the provisions that we will not trespass upon the national park or national monument areas.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Because some of the Members were not here at the time the colloquy took place, would the gentleman mind explaining what was represented by the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado made the statement that the Sierra Club had withdrawn its opposition, that they were now not opposing it as they had in the first place. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] took issue with me and stated that within the last few days he had conversed with Mr. Brower and that that was not their position. So I immediately went to Mr. Brower, who I knew was in the gallery, and asked him. He said that I might advise you that they have withdrawn their opposition to this legislation provided we have within the bill the provisions to which I have just referred.

In addition to the two authorizations just referred to there is a conditional authorization for Curecanti, if and when the Secretary has found it feasible.

Also, there is an authorization at this time for Navaho as a regulatory dam. In connection with the welfare of the Navaho Indians, there is no possible use by them of the water to which they are entitled under treaty rights unless we start with the construction of the Navaho Dam or a similar facility.

Then, in addition to these 4 major projects, there are 11 participating projects which are authorized by this legislation.

The participating projects, with the exception of the central Utah project, are small irrigation projects which are necessary to put the water to use in the upper basin primarily for agricultural purposes. The central Utah project is a large project, it produces power, and it also provides water for municipal use in the Utah area. As I say, it is a large one. The participating projects are the only way by which benefits can be secured to any part of the area as far as irrigation is concerned.

In addition to this authorization, the bill names some 24 projects of some nebulous value in the upper basin to be studied further by the Bureau of the Reclamation to see whether or not they do present any economic value which can be given to the area and to the Nation in the future providing Congress is willing to authorize them. The reason for this, of course, is quite apparent to those of you who have studied the legislation. Under this bill, the State of Colorado, which furnishes 70-plus percent of the total flow of the river and is entitled to

51.75 percent of the upper-basin allocation, gets only 5 small projects, the costs of which are in approximately \$22 million. These projects do not provide for the consumptive use by the State of Colorado of the water to which it is entitled under its allocation. Therefore, in order to firm up possible development in the upper basin, especially in Colorado, these projects are named for further study. If they are economically and physically feasible, why, of course, they will be brought to the attention of Congress for future action.

The authorization for this project is \$760 million. The members of the House committee can advise you that they intend to stay as near that figure as they possibly can provided we go to conference. The value of Federal aid to the lower-basin contributions already made is considerably over \$400 million. Of course, this bill has a statement of intent to the effect that this is not to be the final development in the upper basin.

In the West we have, as many of you know, different water law than the rest of the Nation. Simply stated, it holds that he who first puts water to a beneficial use acquires a perpetual right to that use, a right which no man and no legal entity can impair. So long as the volume of water available for irrigation, power, and domestic and industrial use exceeded the demand, there was no problem. Then with increasing settlement came increasing demand, and the waters of western streams for irrigation and other uses became very valuable and an item of controversy not only among individuals but more importantly among States. The question of control or ownership was uncertain. Some held that the State of origin had complete control even to the point of stopping the entire flow of the river at the State line. Others held that the Federal Government had control of rivers in interstate concourse. Out of this controversy between individuals, States, and the Federal Government there slowly evolved a body of legal opinion that seemed to confirm the supreme right of the first user irrespective of point of origin of the water, place of use, or State line.

This apparent legal determination brought to a head a growing controversy over the waters of the Colorado River. As you know, settlement in the Southwest, coming up from Mexico, preceded that in the Rocky Mountain West. Additionally, most of the land along the lower reaches of the Colorado was flat, had a long growing season, and easily developed for agricultural use. This tended to mean that unless some division was made of the Colorado, first use in the lower basin would forever preclude any development in the upstream States where over 90 percent of the water supply originated. The major drawback to development in the lower-basin area was the erratic flow of the turbulent river. In the spring it was a raging monster, yet by late summer a dangerously low trickle. So far as southern California was concerned, the ever-present problem was just this. The Imperial Valley where the water was used lies below sea level and below the bed of the

Colorado. This created a great danger that the Colorado would turn to this great sink—and, indeed, it did in 1905—and ruin all that had been built. Fighting the annual flood battle was a costly and uncertain proposition. Then late in the summer the low trickle was inadequate for vital water needed in the late-growing season. Beyond this, the then supply canal lay in part in Mexico and this made upkeep and flood prevention more difficult. These circumstances led very early to a determination in this area that flood control was mandatory and so was an all-American canal for water delivery. Storage was also important. Just a little later, the metropolitan area foresaw an end to local or native supply of domestic water and their eyes turned to the far-away Colorado. Economics was the big stumbling block to the achievement of this complicated diversion since it required great pumping operations and cheap electric power to operate them. Out of this, in time, evolved a program which would achieve all these ends and other important projects in southern California. What was required was flood control, river regulation, an all-American canal, and storage and power on the river to make feasible this ambitious undertaking.

In early form, the flood control could have been most easily and cheaply taken care of by a relatively small dam as far down the river as possible, but this would have done nothing for either power, adequate holdover storage, or water regulation or for municipal water. Storage in the early stages appeared most favorable in dams as far up the river as possible, but it was questionable whether this was legal for the dams of necessity would have been in another State. These upstream dams would have taken care of the Imperial Valley irrigation and perhaps the all-American canal, but again have left out municipal water for want of cheap and accessible power in adequate amounts.

Thus it was that the lower basin area sought a program to achieve all these ends in an economic form since none but flood control and some irrigation could stand alone. In time—and with progress in dam engineering—came the concept of a huge dam and reservoir at the point closest to the metropolitan area so that its power would be marketable in the demand area. In this plan all needs could be met—the huge dam would provide both flood control annually any cyclical water regulation and control for both irrigation and municipal use. The huge power output could be utilized to pay for the dam structure and power features, provide cheap pumping power for the municipal water canal and also control the lower river so that lower power dams and diversion points for the municipal and irrigation water would be practical.

Now you will note, and the record is clear, that each separate desire had initially a separate solution of which only flood control was certain both as to economics and legality. You will also note that the key to unlock this dilemma was power, power in such amounts, at such cost, and in such location, that it would

be salable in the power-market area, would be close enough for the municipal pumping and still provide a means of repayment for the only feature not directly related to either reclamation, municipal water supply, or flood control which were the only sure legal methods then existing under law. I say to you then that Hoover Dam and its blessing-bestowing power plant was not an incidental part of the legal flood control, reclamation, or municipal water supply, but rather the only thing that made the whole program even remotely feasible. And now southern California has the gall to come in and complain about the "cash register" dams of the Colorado storage project, and they at least are charged in part to irrigation while not one cent of Hoover Dam was ever charged to irrigation, which it made possible; municipal water, which it made possible; and the flood-control allocation was a minor part of the whole program. I am not speaking idly when I say that my face would be crimson should I so switch my position in just one generation.

But on to the water-use problem. Unless and until the lower-basin area, especially southern California, could insure its complete right to a minimum of water, this ambitious project, even if broken down into parts, was impossible. Up until this time, that is 1920, no final legal determination had been made or was even sure of achievement. Water right depended upon use and here use was impossible without a sure right.

Do not let me seem to imply that the upper-basin area stood by idly through this period. I have pride rather in saying that forward-looking men there were men who were also trying to find means to develop their resources through water use. With the uncertain status of water right, they feared that the lower-basin program would estop upper-area development and they accordingly gave logical opposition to such program seeking instead a uniform development along the river.

Into this ever hotter issue stepped the calm figure of an eminent Colorado water specialist to suggest a division of the water of the Colorado by treaty or compact as between the States desiring its use. This man, Delph Carpenter, thus became virtually the father of a treaty division which was finally achieved in Santa Fe, N. Mex., late in 1922. The lower-basin area, including southern California, welcomed this proposition to establish sure rights so that their development and their construction could proceed. Out of earlier meetings among the States involved, thus came a Colorado River Commission with two members appointed in official action by the Governor of each State—Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. In that concurrence of the Congress and the Federal Government was necessary—and indeed required by the Constitution—for such multi-State agreement, a Federal representative was appointed, Herbert Hoover, then Under Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hoover, incidentally, was elected by

the commissioners as chairman of the interstate group.

Many meetings were held as this group attempted to divide the Colorado River water so much to each of the seven States. It soon became obvious that this was impossible. But in that there was a natural division into an upper basin area and a lower basin area, it was determined to divide the use between the two natural basins. In addition, a decision was rendered by the Supreme Court that the first user of water had the superior right, irrespective of State line—Wyoming against Colorado—in the summer of 1922, and this provided the final push to find an agreement. When worked out, that unanimous agreement was to divide the water in perpetuity between the two natural areas, the upper basin, or highland area, from which the water came, and the lower, or sea-level area. The only reason that the wording did not read as a straight division was that Mr. Hoover, in proper support of the Federal interest, could not then accede to a final ownership or control of interstate water by the States. Nonetheless, the sole purpose of the commission and the compact it drafted was to divide the water and its attendant use.

[H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Report by Hon. Herbert Hoover, Representative of the United States (H. Doc. 605, 67th Cong., 4th sess.) p. A24]

Frequently in the past just such very serious conflicts have arisen on interstate streams resulting in prolonged and expensive litigation and causing long delays in development. This compact, when approved, will be a settlement of impending interstate controversies and an adjudication of rights to the use of the water in advance of construction, thus eliminating litigation and laying the groundwork for the orderly development of a vast area of desert land, estimated at some 4 million acres; the utilization of river flow now unused in the generation of hydroelectric energy, the possibilities of which are estimated at 6 million horsepower; the construction of dams for the control of floods which annually threaten communities in which over 75,000 American citizens now reside, with property worth more than \$100 million; the establishment of new homes and new communities and the creation of a vast amount of new wealth.

The primary purpose of the compact is to make an equal division and apportionment of the waters of the river. For this purpose the river system is divided into an upper and lower basin.

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made. (Article 1 of the Colorado River compact negotiated and signed by the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Ratified by all States except Arizona, including a self limitation requirement for California, as a condition precedent to the Boulder Canyon proj-

ect and proclaimed by President Hoover, June 25, 1929.)

This they achieved by "apportioning in perpetuity"—in article III (a)—"the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum" to each basin with each State to obtain its share—by later in basin agreement they thought—from its own basin. This apportionment was designed to and did exclude the doctrine of appropriation as to use between the two areas. Thus, the early right of the Imperial Valley attached only to lower basin water and not to any upper basin water up to its legal apportionment—section VIII, Colorado River compact.

Unfortunately, even after the adoption of the compact in 1922, controversy still continued. This was not, however, between the States of the upper basin and southern California. Rather, the upper basin States were happy to then add their weight to the passage of the act to build the Hoover Dam and its appertenant structures and thereby set in motion the full development of southern California, for had they not just come to agreement that each area would have a firm and fixed share of water and firm and fixed right to its use? They also lent their support to other lower basin development under the same thinking. Arizona, the other major lower basin user, has been unable to achieve its hope of a major and long-planned development, but we have supported them. The opposition to that project also centered in southern California.

However, over the next few years, it was with not only cooperation but active support from the upper basin area, that the nonreclamation area objection to the Hoover Dam program was finally overcome. May I say to you that the self-same arguments presently being used against the Colorado storage project were used against Hoover Dam and its related works—size, complexity, lack of power market for that cost of power, growing of already surplus crops, public-power opposition, cost, and just plain inertia. Each of these arguments has been doubly discounted by the passage of time and the success of these projects. The mighty Hoover Dam broke the back of the turbulent Colorado and made the lower basin flow useful and profitable. The cessation of the flood menace, the storage and the all-American canal fixed things up fine for the Imperial Valley. The river control made possible the installation of lower power dams and diversion points for other uses, including the metropolitan water diversion. The great storage made possible a firm and fixed supply of water for all periods of the growing season and municipal supply. Best of all, the cheap power made the metropolitan water pumping feasible and provided the cash register to repay, with interest, the cost of the dam and the generating works. By so paying for these, the other canals, diversions and uses could pay for their part of the over-all facilities.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In other words, if power were not assuming a large proportion of the original cost of Boulder Dam, it would be

quite difficult for flood control or reclamation and other uses, river regulation, to repay the Government for the original investment.

Mr. SCATTERGOOD (chief electrical engineer and general manager of the Bureau of Power and Light of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles). It would be utterly impossible, because reclamation could not stand any such cost or even a reasonable share of that cost. (Hearings before Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 6629, 1939.)

As a matter of further fact, the Superior Court of California held that the Boulder Canyon project was not even an irrigation project and that requirements of section 4 of the Reclamation Act had no application—Evan T. Hewes, substituted for John L. DuBois, et al., against All Persons et al., see page 52, Federal Reclamation laws, annotated.

Further reference could be made to the committee hearings on H. R. 9093 in the 3d session of the 76th Congress, pages 118 through 123, or to pages 535, 536 of the first edition of the Hoover Dam documents by Wilbur and Ely, and it must be the first edition for this material does not appear in the later edition except as a reference to see appendix such and such in the first edition.

Here recorded is a letter from John B. Miller, then chairman of the board of Southern Edison Co., written to Secretary of Interior Wilbur which reads:

As has been repeatedly pointed out, the Boulder project is chiefly a water project and our interest in that project is simply securing for the community which we serve the assurance as to an additional supply of water which the community believes it will require.

So far as power is concerned, it is more costly under the contract price proposed than power which we are securing from the alternate source of steam plants.

Even though the Black Canyon site so appropriated—and I use the word "appropriated" since private groups had filed on the site before the whole canyon area was withdrawn by the Federal Government—was the best on the river and even though the lowlands are the best of the area for irrigation, the example of this huge program not only paying its way but creating vast new wealth, is ample demonstration that the Colorado storage project—to utilize water apportioned way back in 1922—will do the same in the upper basin area. As the lower basin development could follow only the achievement of agreement among the States as to water use and the cooperation of at least 6 States in passage of the legislation for construction, it follows that the same situation should obtain for the upper basin. As the Hoover Dam and related works was the program to allow the lower basin the use of its apportioned share of this vital water, so is the Colorado storage project the long delayed but long planned and expected program for use by the upper basin of its share of the water. We fail to understand why what was sauce for southern California is not now sauce for the upper basin. Yet, on the contrary, they are trying to cook our goose. We must have a program similar in magnitude and concept to this if we are to use

our legal allotment of water, and the upper basin States got together not long ago and peacefully divided their upper basin area share. In the lower basin, California has Arizona in the courts and tried to drag us in. Just as the late flow was inadequate for safe use for irrigation in the Imperial Valley—before any metropolitan diversion above it—before storage was provided, so is any safe use in the upper basin impossible in low-water years without compensatory storage in and for the upper basin. Such holdover storage will insure that the upper basin can use its legal share of the erratic flow and still deliver the apportioned sum to the lower basin and Mexico annually.

This need stems all the more forcefully from a dramatic decrease in the average flow of the Colorado. In 1922 when the compact was hammered out, the river was thought to flow in excess of 16 million acre-feet. The average now is down to about 12 million acre-feet, or less by far than the legal division of $7\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet to each basin plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet for Mexico. Divide it how you will, you cannot get $16\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet from 14 million, especially when the bulk of the total flow runs down the river at flood crest when the snow melts in the spring. Holdover storage in the upper basin is required to regulate seasonal flow and also to save wet year water for dry year delivery downstream. Only a bit over half of our legal allotment can be used as a safe supply without such compensatory storage. Efforts to use more would have an adverse effect on all users all along the river in low flow years. At the time of the compact negotiations, Arizona wanted the upper basin to build storage reservoirs similar to those now proposed to insure firm downstream delivery. So far as I can ascertain, California had no such interest for she knew that storage in her own area was necessary for the projects she so much wanted. Now the wheel has turned. Arizona supports this storage, but California, in the form of southern California objection, seeks to prevent the construction of storage other than her own. I say again, she so well knows the value of the power that she wants no other to obtain it. As it now stands, as a matter of fact, she is able to utilize all of the unused flow of the Colorado when it does come by—and she can catch it in storage—and utilize it for the generation of dump power at Hoover Dam. Why, they say to themselves, should we lose this virtually firm but actually cheap dump power? The only reason is that the whole legal structure of power production at Hoover rests upon the firm supply of only the $7\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet of lower basin flow rights—plus Mexico—and all contracts for power have always recognized this fact and the corollary that development contemplated and planned for in the upper basin would reduce the power head to this legally defined minimum flow. So much for that.

CALIFORNIA FIGHTS TO KEEP CHEAP POWER,
HEARING REVEALS

(By George S. Holmes)

WASHINGTON.—"The cat is out of the bag." California's testimony before the Senate In-

terior subcommittee, opposing authorization of the Colorado River storage project, shows that what she fears most is loss of the cheap dump, or secondary electric power which the city of Los Angeles is now buying from Hoover Dam.

The hidden feline was let loose by Gilmore Tillman, assistant city attorney of Los Angeles and attorney for the department of water and power, who confined all his testimony to the effect Los Angeles believes the storage project will have upon its contracts for power from down stream projects.

His views were later corroborated by Northcutt Ely, special counsel for the Colorado River Board of California and an assistant to the attorney general in California, when he made his presentation before the committee.

Mr. Tillman's testimony disclosed that for years the city of Los Angeles has been reaping a bonanza in cheap electric secondary power from Hoover Dam, but now that the filling of the proposed new dams in the storage project might cut off this so-called dump power, it can no longer rely upon it for their customers and their rates would have to be increased.

This excess of dump power, was acquired by Los Angeles as a happy circumstance of the inability of the upper basin States to develop their share of the resources of the Colorado River.

Now that the latter have banded together to obtain storage dams and participating projects for their own advantage, using only their own legal share of the water, Los Angeles has become excited, as revealed by Mr. Tillman's arguments, over the loss of power on which they had no claim in the first place and on which they have no claim now.

It was just the good luck of Los Angeles that it could buy and use this excess power at bargain rates. Now, the big town comes out into the open at last and is fighting against losing something that never actually belonged to her.

The latter point is admitted by Mr. Tillman in his brief, in which he said, in discussing the amounts of energy involved:

"I wish to emphasize that I do not contend or even suggest that any of these estimates or assumptions by the Government constitute guaranties. They are necessarily based on two factors which cannot be anticipated with certainty—the actual runoff of the Colorado River and the time of the development of upstream diversions authorized by the Colorado River compact.

"If, in experience, either of these two factors deviates from the original estimate or assumption, and this deviation results in a diminution of secondary or even firm power, as estimated, we have no ground for complaint."

"On the other hand, it is equally clear that the United States has no right willfully and voluntarily to divert to some other purpose of its own, water which would otherwise be available for the generation of firm and secondary energy at Hoover Dam.

"Upon this ground, as a representative of a public agency threatened with serious injury, I object to the construction of the storage units proposed in the bill now pending before this committee (S. 500) and their operation in the manner contemplated by the Department of the Interior as evidenced by House Document 364 and by testimony introduced before this committee."

Thus, as this reporter views his testimony, Los Angeles is now making claim to something which the city's own attorney says it has no right to claim.

Dump-power has always been sold wherever available, at cheaper rates than firm power, because the supply is neither stable nor predictable.

It is purchased at a risk and therefore commands a cheaper price.

The only power guaranteed Los Angeles at Hoover Dam is the firm power acquired under the contract. All else is gravy. It is this gravy Los Angeles is now seeking to hang on to, even if meant that Colorado and the upper basin States could never develop their own resources, in accordance with the river compacts.

Depriving Los Angeles of this nonguaranteed and fluctuating excess electric power, because the upper basin States will have some life-saving, river-regulating reservoirs to fill, now becomes an invasion and violation of the rights of the city of Los Angeles, according to Mr. Tillman.

The Los Angeles legal representative cites the amount of money the city has expended in transmission lines from Hoover Dam and how much it is now going to cost the city to buy fuel oil in case it cannot enjoy the use of the dump power it has been getting all these years at a low rate.

"In an average year," complained Mr. Tillman to the committee, "the water thus diverted (for filling the proposed reservoirs) necessarily will be replaced by 760,000 barrels of fuel oil. At a price of \$1.80 per barrel, the oil thus substituted for falling water would cost \$1,365,000."

Discussing it in further detail, Tillman says the total extra net cost for replacement fuel for all secondary energy, would be approximately \$2,152,000 in a normal year.

Thus Los Angeles is now promoting a vested interest in a benefit from the river to which she admits having no guaranty. In fact, Mr. Tillman spelled out the demands of Los Angeles as follows:

"In order to fulfill its obligations and maintain the integrity of its existing contracts, the United States must:

"1. Deliver at Hoover Dam, for the generation of firm and secondary energy, the full run of the river, less all upstream diversions for domestic or agricultural purposes; or

"2. During the filling period of the proposed storage units, deliver to the Hoover Dam power contractors, at the applicable contract firm or secondary rate, energy which in quantity and in time and place of delivery is equivalent to that which would have been generated at Hoover Dam had no water been diverted to this upstream storage; or

"3. During the filling period of the proposed storage units, make full financial reparation to the Hoover Dam power contractors for the costs to them (including capital costs, where appropriate) of the replacement of all "firm" or "secondary" energy which would have been generated at Hoover Dam had no water been diverted to this up-stream storage."

The legalities of the situation, it may be noted, revolve around the questions raised by Governor Johnson, as to whether or not waters impounded by the upper basin for power generation, in order to regulate the river and provide power revenues for building the participating units can be withheld for those purposes or must be interpreted as surplus waters which must be released to the lower basin for beneficial consumptive use.

Quoting Governor Johnson on this matter by calling it a very fair assumption, Northcutt Ely, of Ely and McCarty, legal representatives here of the Colorado River Board of California, supports the position of Mr. Tillman and told the committee that water appropriated in the lower basin, even though excess or surplus waters, may not be withheld from use, for the generation of power. Mr. Ely asserted that if the upper basin States could curtail water during the filling period, legally, they could also do it lawfully at any other time.

"Is it your contention," asked Elmer Bennett, congressional liaison representative of the Interior Department, at the Senate hearings, "that the generation of power in the

lower basin has a priority or preference somehow, under the compact, over power generation in the upper basin, assuming the right to use were on a par otherwise?"

"We say," replied Ely, "That the rights established under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the power contracts made thereunder, cannot lawfully be interfered with by the withholding of water at Glen Canyon or other upstream dams solely for power generation."

Whatever the outcome of this legal problem, accentuated by Governor Johnson's testimony and statements, it demonstrates the dog-in-the-manger policy of California charged by members from the upper basin States and that its real fear is the loss of its cheap "dump power" from Hoover Dam.

Do not think either that the passage of the Hoover Dam legislation was the last example of upper basin support for lower basin development. After Hoover was built and in operation, it was found by southern California that the program they had calculated would not work as they had planned or as they had said it would when obtaining agreement for support from the other States. Accordingly, they wished to have the Boulder Canyon Project Act revised. This led to a series of events culminating in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. This too is a great story if time permitted its telling, but I shall have to cover it rapidly and insert material to cover the parts which might be useful for reference.

I mentioned before that the record shows that all hands were fully aware of the fact that power at Hoover Dam was not an incidental to the development but rather the very key. Of the \$173 million cost of Hoover, 100 percent was to be recovered from power. It may be that the now deferred \$25 million flood control allocation will not be repaid, but all repayment comes from power alone. It was also known by many that contracts to take Hoover power were signed even though the allottee knew that the hydropower cost was in excess of then existing alternate generating facilities. Southern California had assured all questioners that the power would be taken at its cost, and so demonstrated in a show of remarkable faith by signing such contracts. Then, by the time power came on the line in 1937, events external to the Colorado had also altered the situation. Interest was down from 4 to less than 3 percent. Steam or other generation had increased in efficiency and decreased in cost—also due to depression prices—and the Federal Government had built such power projects as TVA, Bonneville, and initiated such projects as Fort Peck on the Missouri, where power rates were not on a competitive basis as for Hoover but rather on an amortizing basis at less cost. Such concept was written into the reclamation law in 1939 and represented a material advancement in resource development.

Naturally power users on the Hoover line wanted an adjustment in charges more in conformity with life. Under the Boulder Canyon Act, such readjustments could have been made in 1945, but millions in extra cost would be charged prior to that time. The other Colorado River States interposed objection—not to the

readjustment but to potential changes in the original act applicable to them. Arizona and Nevada had each been guaranteed a payment of 18¾ percent of surplus revenues beyond the amount needed for repayment—the balance, or 62½ percent, of surplus revenue being allocated to repayment of flood-control features. And I may interpose the thought that this charge for flood control should never have been necessary, but this extra burden was accepted in order to get water and meet ill-conceived opposition. If the proposed rate adjustment were to provide solely for an amortizing basis, then these in lieu of tax payments to Arizona and Nevada would have been abrogated, and, in addition, the proposal to defer repayment of the flood-control allocation until after the repayment of all other costs would have postponed almost indefinitely the agreed payment into a special fund to provide for further study and development along the Colorado. This fund was to survey development all along the river, but its greatest value would have been to the upper basin area.

So it was that the interested States again undertook to negotiate their desires into an agreement. Accordingly each of the Governors appointed 2 members to a committee which, when 2 power allottees were added, became known as the committee of 16. This committee, when agreement was unanimously achieved, appointed a committee of three to draft the actual adjustment bill and present it to the Congress with proper notation of the unanimous agreement. One of the committee of three, and the one who carried the ball in the Senate hearings, was the late Judge Clifford Stone, of Colorado. His contribution all the way through this matter was of considerable and then appreciated value. The appreciation did not last very long, but Judge Stone did live long enough to see the program report for the development of the upper basin and of Colorado, which report he understood to be an integral part of the Boulder Adjustment Act.

The unanimous agreement reached by the 7 States and power allottees was briefly: That interest charges be reduced from 4 to 3 percent; that rates be established not on a competitive but on an amortizing basis; that to replace the 18¾ percent promise to each of Arizona and Nevada, an annual payment of \$300,000 would be made; that the repayment of the flood control cost be postponed at least until all other features were repaid; and, finally, to insure the future development along the Colorado that \$500,000 annually be paid into the Colorado River development fund for investigation and construction subject to appropriation by Congress. These concepts were adopted, with the unanimous support of the upper basin Representatives as the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act. Should it seem that much was given for little, let the record also show that competent estimates at that time were that these adjustments would save southern California some \$100 million, while the other changes were merely to insure certain payment

of amounts stated in the original act since these payments would have been wiped out by California's suggestions for adjustment.

This adjustment act was passed in the summer of 1940—not long ago. Up until that time, cooperation and mutual support was a great thing according to southern California. However, when the plan of development for the upper basin was worked out from the money provided, as I mentioned, in the adjustment act, and from earlier studies, southern California decided that cooperation had lost all its purpose—all this in just a few years between 1940 and 1950. What was useful in 1940 to obtain a desired end, suddenly died in 1950 when others came forward with long-awaited plans of development. Since 1950, expensive opposition from southern California has become increasingly frantic and the last 14 months have brought an ever-increasing flood on antiupper Colorado storage project propaganda pouring from this well-organized and well-financed group—and you have seen this in the RECORD and elsewhere.

The program spelled out in this proposal is the outgrowth of negotiations and conferences of water leaders in the West going all the way back to 1900—or over 50 years. After these long negotiations and conferences of the interested States and Federal agencies, it was Colorado's thought that the water had been divided and its full use in each basin spelled out and provided for and use by States in the upper basin. Accordingly, Colorado has given its full and often crucial support to the great programs and projects which allowed southern California to develop for use over three-fourths of the whole lower basin share of water. It was understood that such mutual cooperation and support would continue, even though all agreed that the lower basin projects were least expensive and easiest to build.

In hours of need, as in the necessary adjustment of the original Boulder Canyon Act, and indeed in its very passage, Colorado has been pleased to help her neighbor. She has also acquiesced to use by other States of great volumes of water from the Colorado even though she alone supplies three-fourths of its total flow.

Now the hour has finally come for the development of her share. The very success of development, primarily in southern California, on the lower Colorado proves that this program is valuable and economically worthwhile to the Nation. We cannot understand southern California's opposition in any terms other than that she, in view of such values, wishes to have them all for herself.

Acting in conformity with section 15 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, passed in 1928, and section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, passed in 1940, the Bureau of Reclamation carried on extensive studies and investigations on the Colorado River. These investigations and the formation of a report were intensified in the years 1940 to 1945 and the forepart of 1946. On June 7, 1946, a departmental report of the Department of the Interior was issued

This followed and was based upon a report and recommendations, dated March 22, 1946, by the directors of regions 3 and 4, Bureau of Reclamation. The 1946 report stated that there was not enough water available in the Colorado River system for full expansion of existing and authorized projects and for all potential projects referred to in the report. The report stated further that there was a pressing need for a determination of the rights of the respective States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact and its associated documents and recommended that the States determine their respective rights in such matter. The report was submitted, as required by law, to the affected States for their respective views. Colorado submitted its comments and criticisms, and concurred in the conclusion that there should be an apportionment of water among the States of the upper basin. In his report to Congress on July 24, 1947, the Secretary of Interior recommended among other things "that the States of the upper Colorado River Basin and States of the lower Colorado River Basin should be encouraged to proceed expeditiously to determine their respective rights to the waters of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact."

Acting in conformity with the suggestions contained in the 1947 report the upper basin States negotiated and signed the upper Colorado River Basin compact which compact was approved by Congress April 6, 1949. The upper Colorado River compact is subject to the provisions and limitations of the Colorado River compact of 1922. It apportions the consumptive use of upper basin waters to the upper basin States as follows:

- Arizona, 50,000 acre-feet.
- Colorado, 51.75 percent of balance.
- New Mexico, 11.25 percent of balance.
- Utah, 23 percent of balance.
- Wyoming, 14 percent of balance.

It provides further for the creation of an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. Other important provisions are: First, that States of the upper basin must assume the responsibility for losses of water occurring as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed in the upper basin; and second, that consumptive uses of water by Indians shall be charged to the State in which the use is made.

These acts then are the law of the river:

- (a) The Colorado River compact.
- (b) The Boulder Canyon Project Act.
- (c) The California Limitation Act.
- (d) The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act.
- (e) The Treaty with Mexico.
- (f) The upper Colorado River Basin compact.

The legislation now before this committee provides that whatever authorization is approved by Congress in this respect, the administration of such must comply with the "law of the river."

With the signing and approval of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the States of the area were in position to request of the Department of the Interior that it file its final reports with Congress

on those projects ready for consideration by Congress. The States of the upper basin then proceeded to draft the necessary legislation. The first bill to be presented to prospective sponsors was forwarded from the upper Colorado River Commission, with offices in Grand Junction, Colo., on October 10, 1951. The substitute bill now before the committee is a greatly modified and reduced bill from the one originally recommended by the commission. The bill presently before us is also greatly reduced from the proposal as originally suggested by the Department. It is, however, the opinion of the majority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the legislation now recommended is sufficient in authority, and size for the purposes intended.

When the upper Colorado River development report was approved by formed Secretary of the Interior Chapman, he said:

The comprehensive plan for the upper Colorado River Basin provides a blueprint for one of the few remaining great basin areas of the West which are not already well on the way to full use of their water resources. The 48.5 million acre-feet of storage space provided for in the plan compares with present available reservoir storage of less than 2 million acre-feet. The hydroelectric capacity of 1,622,000 kilowatts compares with less than 125,000 kilowatts of existing capacity in the upper basin, including internal combustion and steam plants as well as hydroelectric plants.

Now that the upper basin compact, which apportions the available water among the States, is in force, urgently needed irrigation projects may be undertaken to turn dry land into productive farms and to supplement the meager water supply on several hundred thousand acres of presently irrigated land. An urgent need also exists for the hydroelectric power made possible by the storage reservoirs to permit utilization of the upper basin's natural resources, including timber and vast deposits of coal, petroleum, oil shale, phosphate, and other minerals.

This statement was accompanied by one from the then Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, Goodrich Lineweaver, when he said:

The States of the upper basin can realize the use of their apportioned water only when extensive river regulation is provided to assist them in meeting the downstream delivery of 75 million acre-feet in a 10-year period as provided by the Colorado River Compact. This regulation can only be obtained by means of large reservoirs holding over great quantities of water from years of high runoff to years of low runoff. Judging from past records, these cycles might be as long as 20 to 25 years. Therefore these reservoirs must be ready to store water many years ahead of the actual time of need for irrigation purposes.

In view of the existing national emergency, consideration should also be given to the suitability of the power features of the storage project as they relate to the national defense.

Bills authorizing the upper Colorado River project have been thoroughly and minutely considered by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior of the House. Over 100 hours have been spent in taking testimony during the last two Congresses. Approximately 25 hours of marking up procedures have been spent in considering the legislation; 2,886 pages of testimony have been taken. In fact, the leg-

islation has been most thoroughly considered. Although there is a minority report it is only fair to advise this committee that the legislation now recommended has been reported to the House by a vote of better than 3 to 1 in the Committee on Interior.

H. R. 3383, as amended by the substitute here recommended, provides for irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal water, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

Two kinds of project installations are provided: First, the first category known as project units consisting of four major dams; and second, the second category known as participating projects consisting of 11 auxiliary or subsidiary smaller projects made up of smaller dams, division works and canals and laterals. Three of the larger units and one of the participating projects have hydroelectric facilities included in their construction and operation.

The pertinent facts of the major units which are to be used for the regulation of the river, storage of water to guarantee mutually agreed upon deliveries to the lower basin, and the production of needed electric power are:

Glen Canyon Dam to be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 13 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, the dividing point between the upper and lower basins. The dam would be a concrete, curved, gravity-type structure rising 700 feet from bedrock. The reservoir, which would be the final regulating storage point for deliveries to fulfill lower basin commitments under the compact, would have capacity of 26 million acre-feet including 20 million acre-feet of active capacity. The reservoir, when filled, would have a maximum water surface of 153,000 acres and would extend about 186 river miles up the Colorado, nearly to the mouth of the Green River, and 71 river miles up the San Juan. The reservoir would be the principal sediment repository in the upper basin. In 200 years, at present rate of sediment flow in the river, silt deposits would fill all inactive storage space and reduce the active storage space by half. The power plant would be located near the toe of the dam and would consist of seven generating units with a total installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts. The plant would have a mean power head of 480 feet. Total cost is estimated at \$379,143,000.

Flaming Gorge unit includes the Ashley Dam which would be located on the Green River 32 air miles north of Vernal, Utah, and the same distance downstream from the Utah-Wyoming border. Ashley Dam would be a concrete, gravity-type structure rising 491 feet from bedrock. Flaming Gorge Reservoir, created by the dam, would have total storage capacity of 3,940,000 acre-feet including active capacity of 2,950,000 acre-feet. When filled, the reservoir would have a water surface area of 40,800 acres and would extend 91 miles upstream, to within 3 or 4 miles of the town of Green River, Wyo. The powerplant would consist of 3 units with a total installed capacity of 72,000 kilowatts operating un-

der a mean head of 395 feet. Estimated cost of construction is \$74,648,000.

Navaho Dam site is on the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico, about 19.5 river miles upstream from Blanco and 34 miles east of Farmington, N. Mex. It is 3.5 miles downstream from the confluence of the Pine and San Juan Rivers. The dam would be an earth-fill structure 360 feet high and the reservoir would have a total capacity of 1,200,000 including an active capacity of 1,050,000 acre-feet. When filled to capacity, the reservoir would have a water surface of 10,800 acres and would extend 33 miles up the San Juan River to 3.5 miles beyond the town of Arboles, Colo. The powerplant would have 3 units with installed capacity of 30,000 kilowatts and operate under a mean head of 275 feet. Total cost is estimated at \$32,933,000.

Curecanti unit includes a concrete, gravity structure rising 510 feet from bedrock and located a few miles downstream from Sapinero, Colo., on the Gunnison River. The capacity of the Curecanti Reservoir would be 940,000 acre-feet of water with as yet an undetermined amount of hydroelectric power. In addition to the major dam it is contemplated that there shall be three smaller power-producing dam installations a short distance down the river from the major dam itself.

The participating projects with pertinent facts for each one are:

Central Utah project, Utah: The comprehensive Central Utah project, a large multiple-purpose development, is of such magnitude that it has been planned in two parts—the initial phase, a unified portion that could operate independently, and the ultimate phase. Only the initial phase is included in the group recommended for initial participation in the upper Colorado River account.

The initial phase would intercept the flow of streams on the south slope of the Uinta Mountains as far east as Rock Creek and would convey the water westward by gravity flow for use in the Bonneville Basin. Water for replacement and expanded irrigation in the Uinta Basin would be provided by storage on local streams. Several regulatory reservoirs would be required in both the Bonneville and Uinta Basins, the principal one being the enlarged Strawberry Reservoir on the Strawberry River. By construction of Soldier Creek Dam the capacity of the reservoir would be increased from 283,000 acre-feet to 1,370,000 acre-feet. The initial phase would provide for the irrigation of 29,600 acres of new land and 165,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water or improved water regulation. It would also provide 48,800 acre-feet of water annually for municipal, industrial and related uses. It would generate each year approximately 359,100,000 kilowatt-hours of firm energy and 3,400,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy.

Emery County project, Utah: Irrigation water would be furnished 24,080 acres of land under existing canals diverting water from Cottonwood Creek to Huntington Creek in east-central Utah near Castle Dale. Supplemental water would be provided for 20,450 acres

of the land and a full new supply would be provided for 3,630 acres. The irrigation water would be made available through storage of surplus spring runoff at a 57,000 acre-foot reservoir at the Joes Valley site on Cottonwood Creek. Water for lands in the Huntington Creek area would be conveyed by canal from Cottonwood Creek.

Florida project, Colorado: Lemon Reservoir, with a capacity of 23,300 acre-feet, would be formed by the Lemon Dam on the Florida River in southwestern Colorado, southeast of Durango. This reservoir would regulate the Florida River runoff to provide an irrigation water supply for 18,950 acres, including 12,650 acres now irrigated with only a partial supply and 6,300 acres not now irrigated. Approximately 1,000 acres of the land in the project area are Indian owned. The regulatory storage provided for irrigation would reduce floods which nearly every year cause extensive damage along the river course.

Hammond project, New Mexico: The Hammond project would divert natural flow of the San Juan River to provide an irrigation supply for 3,670 acres of presently unirrigated land along the south side of the river near Bloomfield, N. Mex. The water would be diverted from the river by a low diversion dam and conveyed to the project land by a gravity canal. A pumping unit would be installed to lift water 49 feet from the gravity canal to two highline laterals that would serve about 1,100 acres of the project land.

LaBarge project, Wyoming: Unregulated natural flow of the Green River would be diverted for the irrigation of 7,970 acres of land located west of the river between Big Piney and LaBarge in southwestern Wyoming. Only 300 acres of the land are cultivated and partially irrigated at present. The principal construction feature would be a canal 38 miles long, mostly of earth section.

Lyman project, Wyoming: Water would be stored in an offstream reservoir of 43,000 acre-foot capacity at the Bridger site on Willow Creek to furnish supplemental irrigation water for 40,600 acres of land along Black Fork near the town of Lyman in southwestern Wyoming. The reservoir would be fed by canals from Black Fork and West Fork of Smiths Fork.

Pine River project extension, Colorado and New Mexico: The extension is planned to enlarge and lengthen distribution works in order that storage water already available in Vallecito Reservoir of the Pine River project might be furnished to some of the arable project land still unirrigated in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico. The extension would serve 15,150 acres of land, including 1,940 acres administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Seedskadee project, Wyoming: This project would irrigate 60,720 acres of presently unsettled land located along both sides of the Green River in southwestern Wyoming, about 35 miles east of Kemmerer. The land would be irrigated by gravity diversions from the Green River. Two drops in distribution canals would drive turbines to lift water to

higher land. No reservoir storage would be required.

Silt project, Colorado: A reservoir of 10,000 acre-feet capacity would be constructed on Rifle Creek in west-central Colorado near Rifle. Most of the reservoir water would be released to water users downstream, replacing part of the natural flow heretofore used. In exchange for the storage water an equivalent amount of natural-flow water would be diverted from East Rifle Creek above the reservoir and conveyed to project land in Dry Elk Valley and on Harvey Mesa. Water would also be conveyed from the reservoir to land under the Davie ditch in Rifle Creek Valley. During the low stages of the reservoir pumping would be required. In all, 5,000 acres of land would be provided a supplemental water supply and 1,790 acres would be provided a full new supply.

Smith Fork project, Colorado: Surplus runoff of Smith Fork and Iron Creek would be regulated in a reservoir of 14,000 acre-foot capacity at the Crawford site on Iron Creek in west-central Colorado near Crawford. Water from Smith Fork would be diverted to the reservoir by feeder canal. The stored water would be conveyed by canal to land on Grand View Mesa and land adjacent to Cottonwood Creek. Part of the released storage water would replace natural flow on this land, permitting additional diversions of natural flow to land above the reservoir in the upper Smith Fork Basin. A total of 9,800 acres would be benefited, including 7,670 acres now inadequately irrigated and 2,130 acres of dry land.

Paonia project, Colorado: The Paonia project provides for construction of a dam at Spring Creek "B" site on Muddy Creek, a tributary of the north fork of the Gunnison River. The dam will form a reservoir of 18,000 acre-foot capacity in the west-central Colorado near Paonia. The reservoir will provide supplemental water for 14,830 acres now irrigated with only a partial water supply and a full supply for 2,210 acres not heretofore irrigated. Work is nearing completion on the enlargement and extension of the Fire Mountain Canal which will distribute project water. Land served from the extension will include land now irrigated from Minnesota Creek and land on Rogers Mesa now irrigated from Leroux Creek. Leroux Creek water will then be diverted higher upstream and used for irrigation on Redlands Mesa.

Some 24 probable participating projects are listed in section 2 of the legislation for further study and determination by the Bureau of Reclamation. There is no attempt at authorization of these projects in this bill—only a direction for their further survey. Each one if found to have merit and feasibility must be brought back to Congress for study and final legislation.

The legislation now before this committee does not contain the controversial Echo Park unit. The substitute legislation proposed by the committee goes much further in that it provides "that as part of the Glen Canyon unit, the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National

Monument"; and, further, "it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument." And may I here and now advise this committee that the sponsors of the legislation promise and agree with the Members of the House that they shall keep their agreement with the conservationists of the Nation in this particular.

The bill as now recommended to the House complies with all important and pertinent provisions of the national reclamation law of 1902 and acts amendatory thereto. The repayment features, although somewhat technical, are in virtual conformity with all reclamation-law requirements. In some particulars there is a closer conformity to such requirements than in like-size projects heretofore authorized, many of which are already constructed, and others now in the process of construction. The recommended legislation provides for the construction and Federal control of necessary transmission lines and the sale of electric power to preferential customers as provided in general reclamation law.

The 160-acreage limitation provision of reclamation law is applicable. The small amount of facilities required for public recreation and propagation of fish and wildlife values must be constructed and operated in accordance with reclamation law.

By the expressed terms of the bill any and all construction is entirely dependent upon budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the Nation—Congress and its pertinent committees having absolute control in this respect.

Planning for development shall have regard for the achievement in each State of the fullest consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the law of the river in the storage and release of waters impounded by the facilities to be constructed under the provisions of this legislation. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to comply any State of the Colorado River basin is authorized to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce compliance.

The amount of the authorization is \$760 million and the committee is of the opinion that the cost of the work authorized by the bill can be kept well within this figure. This total amount is indeed a large sum. However, it is to be expended over a period of approximately—if times continue to be fairly good—25 years. The amount of moneys needed in any 1 year will never amount to more than \$40 million. This means that in no year during its entire construction will the general treasury of the United States be asked for more than \$18 million. In fact, at the end of the construction period the drain on the general treasury will be far less—this because of the fact that the reclamation fund itself will be able to furnish 75 percent of all moneys needed. The amount of the total authorization compares favorably with Central Valley

of California up to now; far less than the authorization for the Missouri River Basin, which is proving so beneficial to the basin specifically and to the Nation generally; and about one-half of the total amount needed for the financing of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, in which project our country has agreed to furnish a rather major part.

The need is immediate for getting started on the actual construction of this project. We have reached the point in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming where we cannot consider any substantial further development of the waters of the Colorado River until we have achieved a measure of regulation of the erratic flow of the river. By regulations, of course, I mean that approach to equalization of flow of the river system, which can be achieved only by storage. This storage must be of such capacity that flows in wet years can be caught and held for release in dry years to meet our commitment to the lower basin. Without such equalizing storage any full development in the upper basin would have disastrous effects on both basins in low water years. Without the benefits of cyclical storage we can only sit and watch the waters run downhill.

Immediately following the decision of the sponsors of H. R. 3383 to not bring it up for House consideration during the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, a further study of some of the provisions of the bill was made by various representatives of the upper basin States. After many conferences it was decided that the legislation would be more equitable to all of the States directly concerned in the upper basin if further provisions were incorporated in the bill to guarantee to each of the upper basin States possible water resource development so each of said States would be able to put to consumptive use the waters allocated to it by the upper Colorado River basin compact. Accordingly, there have been incorporated in section 5 of the bill, that section having to do with the establishment of the basin fund and the bookkeeping procedures relative thereto, provisions which after certain general repayment obligations would divide the excess net revenues accruing from the storage facility projects equitably among the States.

Before final recommendation to the House of these new suggestions, the Office of the Department of Interior was requested to review the repayment analysis of various projects of the bill, especially the central Utah project, to ascertain whether or not the Department of the Interior could comply with the new suggestions and successfully administer the legislation.

Their reply was forwarded to the committee under date of February 6, this year, and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1956.
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASPINALL: During an informal conference in your office on February 1, 1956, representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation were asked to review the repayment analysis

of the central Utah project (initial-phase development) in view of certain amendments now under consideration concerning procedures set out in H. R. 3383, a bill for authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

We are pleased to comply with your request and submit the results of our review based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period.

These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage-project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5 percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of—

(a) Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs;

(b) Interest on power investments;

(c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation;

(d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Under the terms of the proposed amendments of H. R. 3383 a basin fund could be established providing the Utah projects the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent. In doing so, total credits in the basin fund would be governed by the requirements of Utah's participating projects because of their magnitude. Credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383. In fact only one-third of these credits will be required to complete the repayment of all the projects proposed in H. R. 3383, namely, central Utah and Emery County projects in Utah; Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, and Florida projects in Colorado; the Pine River extension project in Colorado and New Mexico, the Hammond project in New Mexico, the Seedskaadee, LaBarge, and Lyman projects in

Wyoming, and the presently authorized Eden project in Wyoming.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

Immediately thereafter a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation delivered to me a statement of the Bureau's repayment summary, together with a statement of its analysis. I include both at this time for the consideration of this committee. It is my understanding that the Bureau's letter, summary, and analysis amount in fact to a statement by them that they are able and willing to conform in this respect to the wishes as expressed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT SUMMARY—COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH H. R. 3383 DATED FEBRUARY 8, 1956

This repayment summary of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects has been prepared to demonstrate how repayment of the project could be accomplished as required by H. R. 3383 dated February 8, 1956.

Storage units consisting of Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Navaho Dam and Reservoir and participating projects consisting of La Barge, Seedskaadee, Lyman, Eden, Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, Florida, Pine River extension, Emery County, central Utah (initial phase) and Hammond have been included in this analysis with construction costs limited to approximately \$760 million as prescribed by H. R. 3383.

This analysis has been accomplished based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period. These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5

percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of:

(a) Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

(b) Interest on power investments.

(c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation.

(d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Net revenues from the units of the storage project and from the participating projects approximating \$1,800 million would be adequate to repay all the costs of the project under the terms or conditions established in H. R. 3383 and in addition would provide a surplus in the basin fund of some \$480 million even with power costs being repaid with interest in 82 years following installation of the last power unit, a considerably shorter time than permitted by H. R. 3383.

A brief tabular summary and a detailed payout schedule are attached. Under H. R. 3383 some flexibility is inherent in the repayment of the project power costs. Should the Curecanti unit be included in the immediate future there would be a somewhat greater surplus in the basin fund. Also, the basin fund could be increased somewhat by extending the construction schedule of major participating projects.

Repayment summary

[Thousands of dollars]

Item	Construction cost	Interest during construction	Reimbursable cost
Estimated project cost.....	758, 813		
Allocation of costs:			
Irrigation.....	282, 784		292, 106
Power.....	422, 744	31, 231	453, 974
Municipal and industrial water.....	40, 950	1, 446	42, 396
Subtotal reimbursable.....	746, 478		788, 476
Ultimate phase features central Utah.....	4, 950		
Nonreimbursable costs.....	7, 385		
Repayment of reimbursable costs:			
Irrigation ¹			292, 106
From water users.....			36, 546
From power revenues.....			255, 560
Power ²			453, 974
Municipal and industrial water ³			42, 396
Subtotal.....			788, 476
Interest paid on project investment:			
Power ⁴			492, 768
Municipal and industrial water ⁴			32, 332
Subtotal.....			525, 100
Surplus revenues.....			481, 631
Total net revenue.....			1, 795, 207

¹ Excludes \$9,322,000 expended on Eden and Paonia projects under previous authorization.

² Includes \$9,322,000 expended on Eden and Paonia projects under previous authorization.

³ Includes interest during construction.

⁴ Excludes interest during construction.

1 (f) Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Financial repayment schedule in accordance with repayment conditions, storage units, participating projects, costs and allocations as recommended by House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in H. R. 3383, Feb. 8, 1956

[Units \$1,000]

Year of power operation	Fiscal year	Net revenues from sale of power at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and initial phase of the central Utah project at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour				Repayment of irrigation costs			Net revenue from sale of municipal and industrial water	Application of net municipal and industrial revenues		Project investment						Excess power revenues	
		Total	Application of net revenues ¹			By power users	By irrigation	Total		Interest	Municipal and industrial investment	Power investment		Irrigation investment		Municipal and industrial water investment		Annually	Accumulative
			Interest	Power investment	Irrigation investment							Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
	1957														3,643	3,643			
	1958														3,158	6,801			
	1959														3,644	10,445			
	1960														10,445				
	1961														4,460	14,905			
	1962														102,677				
1	1963	7,659	6,899	702	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	34	14	275,976	275,976	27,330	304,008	2,072	103,257	1,353	1,353
		10,475	7,600	1,413	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	33	15	27,330	329,925	27,330	353,668	43,415	145,180		1,339
	1965	13,297	8,248	3,587	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	33	15	27,330	329,925	27,330	353,668	43,415	145,180		1,339
		16,065	8,842	5,035	2,017	2,017	96	2,113	48	33	15	27,330	375,963	27,330	403,293	58,618	162,520		1,309
5		18,797	9,399	7,210	1,783	1,783	109	1,892	48	33	15	28,237	396,990	28,237	425,227	68,750	171,211		1,294
		21,502	9,924	9,270	1,849	1,849	137	1,986	48	32	16	22,711	410,431	22,711	433,142	77,720	188,952		1,278
		22,380	10,261	9,811	1,875	1,875	154	2,029	48	32	16	17,730	418,350	17,730	436,080	80,650	196,002		1,263
	1970	22,933	10,459	9,203	2,082	2,082	285	2,367	1,495	1,058	437		409,147		409,147		220,846	41,043	42,305
		22,831	10,229	8,433	2,275	2,275	377	2,652	1,495	1,047	448		400,714		400,714		218,194		41,868
10		22,723	10,018	8,536	2,296	2,296	387	2,683	1,495	1,036	459		392,178	12,600	392,178		218,111		41,420
		22,621	9,804	8,649	2,295	2,295	387	2,682	1,495	1,024	471		383,529		383,529		225,429		40,961
		22,510	9,588	8,354	2,416	2,416	419	2,835	1,495	1,012	483		375,175	12,019	375,175		234,613		40,490
	1975	22,405	9,379	9,046	3,134	3,134	573	3,707	1,495	1,000	495		366,129		366,129		230,906		40,007
		22,297	9,153	9,164	3,456	3,456	669	4,125	1,495	988	507		356,965		356,965		226,781		39,512
15		22,195	8,924	9,291	3,456	3,456	669	4,125	1,495	975	520		347,674		347,674		222,656		39,005
		22,087	8,692	6,982	3,979	3,979	682	4,661	1,495	962	533		340,692		340,692		217,995		38,485
		21,985	8,517	7,055	3,979	3,979	682	4,661	1,495	949	546		333,637		333,637		213,334		37,952
	1980	21,877	8,341	6,488	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	935	560		327,149	31,765	327,149		209,803		37,406
		21,775	8,178	6,549	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	921	574		320,600		320,600		204,507		36,846
20		21,667	8,015	6,604	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	907	588		313,996		313,996		200,000		36,272
		21,481	7,850	5,481	4,851	4,851	691	5,542	1,495	892	603		308,515		308,515		195,515		35,684
		21,295	7,713	5,432	4,851	4,851	691	5,542	1,495	877	618		303,083		303,083		191,083		35,081
	1985	21,115	7,577	4,374	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	862	633		298,709		298,709		187,127		34,463
		20,929	7,467	4,298	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	846	649		294,411		294,411		183,435		34,005
25		20,743	7,360	4,219	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	830	665		290,192		290,192		179,217		33,830
		20,563	7,255	4,144	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	813	682		286,048		286,048		175,063		33,181
		20,377	7,151	4,062	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	796	699		281,986		281,986		170,908		32,516
	1990	20,191	7,049	3,978	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	778	717		278,008		278,008		166,089		32,058
		20,011	6,950	3,897	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	760	735		274,111		274,111		162,194		31,586
30		19,825	6,853	3,808	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	742	753		270,303		270,303		158,386		31,111
		19,639	6,757	3,718	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	725	772		266,585		266,585		154,525		30,633
		19,459	6,664	3,631	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	704	791		262,954		262,954		150,781		30,155
	1995	19,273	6,574	3,535	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	684	811		259,419		259,419		146,999		29,683
		19,087	6,485	3,438	5,070	5,070	713	5,783	1,495	664	831		255,981		255,981		143,217		29,194
		18,907	6,399	3,343	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	643	852		252,638		252,638		139,442		28,712
		18,721	6,316	3,240	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	622	873		249,398		249,398		135,613		28,223
		18,535	6,235	3,135	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	600	895		246,263		246,263		131,390		27,734
40		18,355	6,156	3,034	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	578	917		243,229		243,229		127,606		27,245
		18,169	6,080	2,924	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	555	940		240,305		240,305		123,722		26,756
		17,983	6,007	2,811	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	531	964		237,494		237,494		119,822		26,267
		17,803	5,937	2,701	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	507	988		234,793		234,793		115,938		25,778
	2000	17,617	5,870	2,582	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	482	1,013		232,211		232,211		112,054		25,289
		17,431	5,805	2,461	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	457	1,038		229,750		229,750		108,254		24,800
45		17,251	5,744	2,342	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	431	1,064		227,408		227,408		104,470		24,311
		17,065	5,685	2,215	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	405	1,090		225,193		225,193		100,686		23,822
		16,879	5,630	2,084	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	379	1,118		223,109		223,109		96,902		23,333
		16,699	5,577	1,957	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	352	1,146		221,152		221,152		93,018		22,844
50		16,513	5,529	1,819	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	321	1,174		219,333		219,333		89,133		22,355
		16,327	5,483	1,679	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	291	1,204		217,654		217,654		85,248		21,866
		16,141	5,441																

1 (f) Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Financial repayment schedule in accordance with repayment conditions, storage units, participating projects, costs and allocations as recommended by House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in H. R. 3383, Feb. 8, 1956—Continued

[Units \$1,000]

Year of power operation	Fiscal year	Net revenues from sale of power at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and initial phase of the central Utah project at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour				Repayment of irrigation costs			Net revenue from sale of municipal and industrial water	Application of net municipal and industrial revenues		Project investment						Excess power revenues	
		Total	Application of net revenues ¹			By power users	By irrigation	Total		Interest	Municipal and industrial investment	Power investment		Irrigation investment		Municipal and industrial water investment		Annually	Accumulative
			Interest	Power investment	Irrigation investment							Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
80	2045	13,837	823	13,014									19,892					0	226,408
		13,837	497	8,028									10,964					4,412	230,820
		13,837	274	1,445									9,519					12,118	242,938
		13,837	238	1,481									8,038					12,118	255,056
		13,837	201	1,518									6,520					12,118	267,174
85	2050	13,837	163	1,556									4,964					12,118	279,292
		13,837	124	1,595									3,369					12,118	291,410
		13,837	84	1,635									1,734					12,118	303,528
		13,837	43	1,676									58					12,118	315,646
		13,837	1	58									0					12,118	327,764
90	2055	13,837																13,837	340,591
		13,837																13,837	354,428
		13,837																13,837	368,265
		13,837																13,837	382,102
		13,837																13,837	395,939
95	2060	13,837																13,837	409,776
		13,837																13,837	423,613
		13,837																13,837	437,450
		13,837																13,837	451,287
		13,837																13,837	465,124
100	2062	13,837																13,837	478,961
		13,837																13,837	492,798
Total		1,683,933	492,768	453,974	255,560	255,560	36,546	292,106	74,723	32,332	42,306	453,974	0	292,106	0	42,306	0	481,631	481,631

¹ Generation based on full use of upper basin water apportionment by year 75.

² Includes \$1,660,000 in year 89 and \$1,719,000 each year thereafter of excess power revenue from central Utah project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

I have no personal ax to grind on this bill. No water or power would come into Nebraska; however, benefits would extend to the entire Nation—all 48 States would be more prosperous because new wealth is created—new industries spring up. New wealth will need many things from the industrial East. It will mean new markets, new jobs, a stronger national economy. I believe in this project as an investment in America. A growing, dynamic America needs to move ahead and prepare for the future.

I cannot, in my 13 years in Congress, recall a campaign more vigorous or more vocal than the one that has been waged by the Members of Congress, the associations, and the "lobbies," if you please, who have seen fit, in their wisdom, to express the fears that the upper Colorado project was a "give away," a water steal, that it would bankrupt citizens of every State in the Union, that the dams would not hold water, that the reservoirs would soon fill with silt, and that the crops grown under these project lands would add to the agricultural crops now in surplus and that the project is not feasible and would cost other States untold millions of dollars. These statements are false, and they will be exposed.

Most of this misinformation comes from the Colorado River Association and you ask, "Who is this association?" The description of this organization as written in the quarterly Lobbying Report to Congress is as follows:

Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Citizens' organization for presenting information concerning Colorado River water matters. Opposes any legislation jeopardizing California water rights on the Colorado River.

This organization has had unlimited funds for propaganda purposes.

I include at this point the lobbying report of the Colorado River Association:

TOTAL ANNUAL RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES REPORTED UNDER THE FEDERAL LOBBYING ACT BY NORTHCUTT ELY (OR ELY, MCCARTY & DUNCAN), THE COLORADO RIVER ASSOCIATION, AND THE SIX AGENCY COMMITTEE, 1951-55

Northcutt Ely (including law offices of Northcutt Ely and—during the two reported periods for 1955—Ely, McCarty & Duncan). (Totals listed cover only the following organizations as employers: Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Imperial Irrigation District, Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, Water Project Authority of the State of California, and the Water Resources Board of California.)

1. Receipts including contributions and loans. The term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution:

A. 1951	\$59,176.04
B. 1952	60,520.26
C. 1953	56,727.42
D. 1954	59,118.29
E. 1955	63,218.75

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise,

or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	\$2,349.37
B. 1952	2,456.31
C. 1953	1,357.42
D. 1954	774.75
E. 1955	524.21

Colorado River Association (where listed as organization filing; does not include where listed as employer of any individual filing).

1. Receipts (totals listed cover contributions of \$500 or more), including contributions and loans (the term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution):

A. 1951	\$109,400.48
B. 1952	140,608.00
C. 1953	59,680.00
D. 1954	136,102.84
E. 1955	195,760.00

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	\$92,622.70
B. 1952	111,538.15
C. 1953	50,595.81
D. 1954	25,288.17
E. 1955	64,403.31

Six Agency Committee (where listed as organization filing; does not include where listed as employer of any individual filing).

1. Receipts (totals listed cover contributions of \$500 or more), including contributions and loans (the term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for

services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution):

A. 1951.....	\$17,400
B. 1952.....	20,000
C. 1953.....	20,000
D. 1954.....	20,000
E. 1955.....	30,000

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951.....	\$26,280.72
B. 1952.....	22,269.96
C. 1953.....	17,821.35
D. 1954.....	17,938.55
E. 1955.....	32,231.36

Mr. Chairman, I am not an engineer and I will have to leave the feasibility or infeasibility of the great project structures to the gentlemen who are qualified by years of training and experience to evaluate these technical factors. They have demonstrated beyond doubt that the project is, from an engineering standpoint, sound. Neither am I a geologist, so I cannot testify as to the rock and soil formations that will be encountered. I do not know where the opponents of this project came by their beakers of so-called Chinle, and until these opponents started casting their straws in the wind, I am sure many people thought "Chinle" was the name of a well-known distributor of a product medically known as "spiritus frumenti." But this is all a part of our educational process, and it is sometimes necessary to lay these things out in the open where we can look at them in the interest of good legislation. The economic report shows the project sound—over 60 percent of the entire cost will be paid back with interest from the production of electrical energy.

WILL THE PROJECT ADD TO THE FARM SURPLUSES?

I am prepared, however, to testify on the two fundamental problems involved in the upper Colorado project. First, the problem of farm surpluses, and, second, the problem of money.

In the past months we have become increasingly aware of the detrimental effect of surplus crops on the national farm income. The Government owns or is the first mortgagee on crops worth more than \$8 billion, and every individual in Government is looking around for someone or something at which to point an accusing finger of blame. More often than not, reclamation projects have been singled out as the villain. But, gentlemen, nothing could be further from the truth. Reclamation adds no more to the surplus than a cap gun does to a shooting war.

The opponents of reclamation would have you believe that the great Federal irrigation projects are causing a terrible economic crisis among the farmers that will lead to their bankruptcy. But they do not cite you to any facts and figures to show just how much of this surplus is produced on irrigated lands. There is a very good reason for that, because except in terms of generalities, the argument falls very flat.

In 1954, only 0.35 percent of the 3 billion bushels of corn, and only 1.7 percent of the 970 million bushels of wheat in the United States, came from lands served by federally irrigated projects. A great part of these surplus grains were grown on dryland farms in areas blessed with adequate rainfall. They did not come from irrigated lands. Three States—Iowa, Illinois, and Minnesota—produced most of the corn and they are not irrigated; very little wheat is irrigated. Corn raised on irrigation projects is generally fed to livestock.

The irrigated West produces almost all of the Nation's apricots, almonds, walnuts, dates, lemons, figs, prunes, and olives. It grows 95 percent of the grapes, 90 percent of the lettuce, 75 percent of the avocados, pears, and cantaloupe. Indeed, it would be unusual to have ample supplies of fruits and vegetables without the great production from the irrigated West.

SURPLUSES OF TODAY MAY BE SHORTAGES OF TOMORROW

When we think of surplus crops, we should also remember that it takes about 10 years to develop a good reclamation district. We should also remember that our population will increase about 3 million yearly. These people will require food. Indeed, the diet of the American people in the world has changed a great deal in the last 25 years. The average person in the United States is eating more of a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables than ever before. It is estimated that more than 200 different farm commodities are in active use on the American table. Many are ample because of irrigation. We are eating 3 times as much citrus fruit as we did 20 years ago and 4 times as many carrots.

The children of today are bigger and taller than they were 25 years ago, all because of an ample diet containing all of the vitamins for good health.

Agricultural experts predict that in 10 years we will need an additional 35 million acres of land upon which to grow the meat that we presently consume. The American people should face reality or we will not escape the horrible nightmare of a shortage of food in the very near future.

It was only 11 years ago that the House of Representatives had a committee investigating the shortage of food. There was a shortage of meat, poultry, wheat, and the things American people enjoy having on their tables. That could happen again. Indeed, if surplus empty stomachs had all the food they need there would be no surplus of crops today.

VALUE OF IRRIGATION

As the House of Representatives begins its debate on the upper Colorado River development, I am sure that many of my colleagues will want information about the value of irrigation. It is right and proper that questions be asked, such as, Why bring more land under production when we have a surplus of crops today; or, How much is this country investing in irrigation power projects? Where does the money come from? How much

money has been paid back? In fact, does irrigation pay—is it necessary?

I know some of you will say, "Congressman MILLER, we will meet that crisis when we come to it." I say, "We cannot sit back and wait." We better start crossing the bridge now and the bridge of more production in this case is reclamation and irrigation. In order to cross that productive bridge later, we must proceed to develop millions of additional acres through irrigation. The problem of producing food and fiber are growing side by side with the expanding population. The arid West needs to stabilize their economy and minimize the shock that comes with crop failure. The people in the arid West realize that they must make good use of their water supplies. They realize that water on good lands brings new wealth and a security so necessary to a growing, dynamic America. To me it is utterly foolish that this Nation, facing agricultural shortages, would sit back idly on a river or creek bank and watch the water run to the sea, when it should be used for irrigation and power. Remember it takes years to develop raw land with good irrigation projects. Some lands under the Colorado River project will take 30 years to bring into production.

It should also be realized that during the last 15 years, croplands have disappeared, some through erosion, and being taken out of production by the Federal Government for building military plants. About 15 million acres of tillable land was taken out of production because it was swallowed up by expanding cities, building of new plants, new highways, parks, and airports.

WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM FOR RECLAMATION?

Reclamation came into existence when Theodore Roosevelt signed the law in 1902, which provided establishment of a Bureau of Reclamation and included a provision for financing Federal undertakings through a revolving fund to be established within the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the reclamation fund.

In the beginning, the fund was supported by the proceeds from the sale of public lands. It was later augmented by a percentage of the royalties from oil holdings and of certain minerals in the United States. It was intended that revenues from these sources, plus revenues derived from repayment of project construction costs, would provide sufficient funds to continue construction of new projects. However, it became evident that the fund was not adequate to undertake major construction projects, and since 1930 appreciable appropriations have been made from general funds of the Treasury, in addition to appropriations from the reclamation fund. Income to the fund is derived from accretions and collections. Accretions to the reclamation fund include 96 percent of the revenues from the sale of public lands, 52½ percent of the revenues from oil leases, 52½ percent of the revenues from royalties and rentals from potassium leases, and 50 percent of the revenues from FPC waterpower licenses.

The income to the reclamation fund from collections results from construction and operation and maintenance repayments on reclamation projects. To date, over \$1,006,580,000 has been appropriated from the reclamation fund. For fiscal year 1956, the amount of \$89,510,000 out of a total of \$170,791,000 appropriated for the reclamation program will come from the reclamation fund.

It is estimated that in another 10 years all the funds for reclamation will come from the revolving fund which is made up of revenue from the sale of public lands, oil leases, and so forth.

MONEY RETURNED TO THE TREASURY

Up to last year, Reclamation had repaid over \$600 million to the reclamation fund and during the present fiscal year approximately \$60 million more will be returned to the Government from the contracts entered into by water users.

Since 1902, about \$2.8 billion has been allocated to reclamation and power projects. Irrigation has used \$1.3 billion; industrial and municipal power \$1,130 million; flood control \$207 million. You will note that of the total amount, about one-half is charged to irrigation. All of the money is returned to the Treasury except that attributed to flood control's \$207 million.

It is interesting to note that flood-control projects have received about 3 times the amount of money that has come to reclamation. Every State in the Union and nearly every community has had some benefit from flood-control moneys. These moneys pay back not one cent to the Federal Treasury in either interest or principal. The reclamation moneys pay back the principal. Money allocated to power projects pay back both interest and principal.

WATER IN STORAGE

The reservoir capacities in our reclamation dams would store 9.2 million acre-feet of water. This amount is sufficient to cover the State of Maryland with about 13 feet of water or Pennsylvania with 3 feet of water. This water is used on about 70 projects to produce crops, generate power, and take care of municipal and industrial water needs. The reclamation dams produce hydroelectric capacities sufficient to serve a nonindustrial city of almost 9 million people.

RETURN FROM POWER

The net power revenue in the fiscal year of 1955 from 34 Bureau of Reclamation powerplants, after deductions for annual operation, maintenance, and replacement, totaled \$31.3 million. Total net power revenue returns to the Treasury through June 30, 1955, amounted to \$257.2 million. Crops produced in 1954 from 69 projects was valued at \$865 million and the total value from the beginning of irrigation now totals \$10.6 billion.

The Federal tax revenue since 1916 from reclamation areas which can be attributed to Federal reclamation developments is estimated to total about \$4.5 billion. This land, my friends, would be almost worthless without good water and without the people working the land.

The retail sales in the 17 Western States totals more than \$43 billion in

1954. Much of this can be attributed to the income from the soil.

IRRIGATION—NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., PROJECT

I want to point out, particularly, one irrigation project with which I am well acquainted. The North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska. Here is a report on an area that would be practically worthless without water being placed upon the land:

1. Irrigated land outproduces comparable dry-farmed land 13 times. Approximately 68 percent of total cropland in the dry-land area is used to produce wheat as compared to less than one-half of 1 percent in the irrigated area.

2. The irrigated area comprising 10 percent of a 4-county area produces 91 percent of the income.

3. Land values in the irrigated area are 7 times greater than adjacent dry land.

4. The irrigated area supports 27 times more people and provides 40 times more income as adjacent dry areas of equivalent size.

5. With irrigation the property tax revenues have grown twentyfold.

6. Federal tax revenues per acre in the irrigated area, in 1953 were 33 times greater than for the adjacent dry-land area. Federal taxes which arise out of the irrigated area and its towns total about \$16 million annually or more than two-thirds the cost of building the project.

7. Adjacent prairie areas lost 12 percent and the irrigated area gained 18 percent in population during the drought and depression years 1930-40.

8. The irrigation farmers spend about \$50 million annually for materials, fuel, and machinery which come from other parts of the Nation.

9. Approximately 72 percent of all reimbursable project costs have been returned to the Federal Treasury. Repayments are being made on schedule.

10. Project farms have produced crops worth 20 times the cost of building the project.

NEW WEALTH PRODUCED

It should be remembered that all of this production from federally operated reclamation projects calls for the shipment of crops and livestock which creates an income for transportation; processing; milling; manufacturing; wholesaling and all of the processes between the farm and the consumer. The steer that is produced and fed on an irrigated farm in the North Platte Valley might be finished in the feed-lots of Iowa, butchered and processed in Chicago and fed to the people of New York City. It is all a way of creating wealth, of creating jobs. It means purchase power for farmers and others whose livelihood depends on production. New wealth means those who produce and process the food from the farm to the table can buy shoes; vacuum cleaners; refrigerators; washing machines, radios and a million items manufactured and produced in the industrial East. I say this, my colleagues, because you in the eastern part of the country should derive a great benefit from the new wealth created from irrigation projects. Water is the life blood of the arid West. Water placed on good soil at the proper time brings a feeling of security, confidence, and new wealth to a community.

— ENDORSED BY PAST PRESIDENTS

President Hoover had this to say about the justification of irrigation:

The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crops, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

The development of reclamation and power projects has been in the platform of the major political parties for many years. President Truman and President Eisenhower have endorse the upper Colorado River storage project. It is a bipartisan matter.

YEARS TO DEVELOP

In the development of the upper Colorado River Basin, two-thirds of the money is allocated to power. Every cent of this will be repaid to the Federal Government with interest. The part earmarked for irrigation is important. It will take 10, 20, or maybe 30 years to develop some of these projects. We should plan today, not for your benefit or mine, but for the benefit of future generations. Water is becoming a more and more valuable resource. It should not be permitted to run to the ocean without first being used.

WATER IS NEEDED IN THE WEST

Water is the lifeblood of the arid West. Water placed on good soil at the proper time, can bring a feeling of security, confidence and new wealth to a community. If we are to eat in the future, we will need to produce more crops.

Before the upper Colorado River project can be completed, we will have more than 250 million people living in the United States. These people will need jobs, they will need food, they will be a part of a growing, dynamic America. Unless you and I have some vision today, these people may not be doing so well 50 years from now.

I call your attention to the inscription cut in stone over the Speaker's table. Have a look at this quotation carved in stone:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered. (Daniel Webster.)

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I fail to find in either of the two reports issued by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that is, the one issued last year when this bill was reported first and the supplemental report issued on the bill that is now before the House in the nature of a substitute, I fail to find the opinion and the criticism of the Director of the Budget.

I do find the Budget Director's opinion of the bill in the Senate report. The report of the Director of the Budget is dated March 17, 1955. Is it true, and I presume it is true, that the House Interior Committee had before it the same Budget Director's report as the Senate committee had?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true. These are words that should be burned into the hearts of the individual who sometimes feels that irrigation and reclamation projects do not pay. We should not be shortsighted and think just of today. We have to think of tomorrow and the future. What are you going to do to take care of future generations?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Having established the fact that the Budget Director's report does not appear in either of the House committee reports on this bill, may I ask the gentleman whether it is true as set forth in the report of the Budget Director of March 17, 1955, that in the absence of detailed planning reports for certain projects now contained in this bill—

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is that the report of the other body?

Mr. DONOVAN. I am reading the Budget Director's report to the Senate side. Is it true that the Budget Director says or reported that for certain reasons the Budget Director believes that the authorizations for Flaming Gorge, in this bill, Curecanti, in this bill, Navaho, in this bill—Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects, all in this bill, should be deferred until the necessary information as to their feasibility justifying their presence in this bill has been submitted to the Congress?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, to answer that.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague. The language just read is in the letter to which the gentleman from New York makes reference. Also, in that letter is the statement, the one, perhaps, which found in favor of Echo Park instead of the Flaming Gorge units. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill gives a conditional authorization to Curecanti and, therefore, Curecanti is still in accordance with the budget message. This bill does not add anything for Navajo participating projects except to state that it is one of the projects to be planned and to be surveyed and reported back. This bill does provide that Navajo Dam, as such, which is not the facility referred to by the gentleman from New York will be authorized and built and paid for out of surplus new power revenues in the upper basin. In other words, the only project in this bill which seems to go counter in any way at all to what the gentleman has referred to is that of Flaming Gorge, and since that report has been written, we have been advised, and I understand the advice will come to us later, that the administration, which speaks higher than

the budget, is in favor of the bill proposed by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The proponents of the proposed legislation are insisting that the approval of this measure will not create competition with, or increase, the surpluses on hand. What in the world are they going to grow out there if they do not grow products similar to those which we have today in surplus, or may help to create surpluses in the future?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman will find that alfalfa and a good many of the feed crops are not in surplus. We are willing to accept an amendment to be offered by your colleague from Kansas in which that is rather clearly spelled out.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield further, it so happens that there will be no participating projects other than, perhaps, the Paonia project, which can be brought anywhere near production within the 10-year period. If you take into consideration the development that means there will not be any of these projects which will be in violation of what the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Are we assured then that as far as wheat and other basic crops are concerned that this project will not compete with those crops? I understand the projects proposed in this bill are not specifically for the production of power. As I understand the measure it provides a little more than two-thirds, power and a little less than one-third for irrigation. I want to make sure none of this expenditure is charged to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman agree with me—and I am reading the actual language of the Budget Director and the only evidence of a position by the Budget Director on this bill, language from the report of March 17, 1955:

For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama and the Navaho participating programs should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress and the budget.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is an answer to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and partici-

pating projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FLOOD THREAT SEEN NEXT SPRING

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a recent press report of Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., the New England division engineer.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have been greatly concerned about conditions in my district, State, and area arising from the devastating floods of last summer and fall. There is a great deal of work to be done regarding rehabilitation and protection, which will require the assistance of the Federal Government, and I am happy to see that the Congress has already acted in order that a sound beginning may be made on programs designed to this end.

General Fleming is an authority on floods and flood-control work and his warning expressed in the article clearly indicates that New England is in a precarious situation and, if any further floods should occur before protective measures have been completed, additional, enormous damage will be done. It is for this reason that I have been urging the utmost speed in carrying out flood-control projects necessary to control raging waters of seasonal storms and spring freshets.

I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by General Fleming and believe that they will be informative to Members of the Congress, as well as useful in enabling all of us to have a better understanding of the danger, which only prompt action by the Congress, looking toward the completion of necessary flood protection, can avert.

[From the Hartford Courant of November 19, 1955]

NEW FLOOD THREAT SEEN NEXT SPRING

BOSTON, MASS., November 18.—Flood-scarred New England will be in for more trouble in the spring if any early hard winter freezes waters at their present level, the Chief of Army engineers in the region said today.

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., spoke at a meeting on flood control problems during the closing day of the 31st annual conference of the New England Council at the Hotel Statler here. He said: "I don't want to be an alarmist, but, if we get an early freeze before a substantial amount of water has a chance to run off, and if we get just a normal snow cover this winter, I think we're in for trouble in the spring."

STREAMS CLOGGED

General Fleming told the flood control meeting that New England streams and ponds are clogged and the region's water table is extremely high due to the heavy rains of this fall.

General Fleming said that upstream reservoirs and channel improvements are the only two feasible weapons against floods in New England. Two other devices—protective dikes such as those at Hartford and selective flooding permitting unvaluable areas to flood to save other sections—have little usefulness in such a highly developed region, he said.

The General maintained that flood control dams in New England should be for that purpose only, and he criticized proposals which have been made in recent months

that the power possibilities of such dams be exploited.

"Power and flood control in New England," he said, "are like oil and water—they just don't mix."

General Fleming explained that a flood control dam to be effective must be kept empty, and that a power dam, if it is to produce power, must be kept full. So-called multi-purpose dams in other parts of the country, he said, are actually a series of reservoirs in one dam. He said New England offers "only two possibilities" for multi-purpose dams from an engineering point of view, and "none from an economic point of view." He did not specify the two possibilities.

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. HOLT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

GOP HARMING IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM

(Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. BURNSIDE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.)

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 23, 1956, issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph entitled "GOP Harming Ike's Road Program":

GOP HARMING IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's highway program in Washington is suffering today from foot-dragging and sabotage from members of his own Cabinet.

Whether accidentally or by design, the performances of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks as witnesses before the House Ways and Means Committee definitely lessened the chances of passage of a highway bill that will carry out the President's program.

The position taken by Humphrey perhaps can be rationalized to be that simply of a treasurer desiring to balance his books whether any roads are built or not.

The position of Secretary Weeks was just plain baffling.

The committee heard Weeks because he has supervision of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Weeks read a long prepared statement praising those sections of the highway bill with which the committee has no responsibility and very little concern.

He was then questioned on the tax features of the bill, which are totally the concern of the committee and were presumably the reason for Weeks' appearance.

The Secretary had no advice and no counsel.

He was unable to answer questions that almost everybody in the room, including the spectators, could have answered readily.

Not only did he not know the answers, he refused to let two officials of the Bureau of Public Roads give the answers themselves. It was more than sheer ignorance.

It was obvious to everyone present that Weeks was not going to help the Democrats write a tax bill to finance the Eisenhower highway program.

If the Eisenhower program is voted down in the House because of lack of Republican support, the blame can be traced directly to the attitude shown by Humphrey and Weeks.

They were negative witnesses.

Apparently the President will have to state his position again.

He will have to state it bluntly and specifically so that no one will confuse his position with that taken by his two Cabinet members.

He has said already that he will support a highway bill financed by higher taxes, and in saying so he attempted to make the bill bipartisan.

At least that is the way everybody but Humphrey and Weeks saw it.

Their actions have served only to confuse those Republicans who will have to vote on the bill.

They are wondering which administration position is the official one.

The Weeks' performance looked particularly bad because he was preceded as a witness by a Republican who intelligently and enthusiastically supported the highway bill and its tax schedule.

He was Charles P. Taft, mayor of Cincinnati, and a brother of the late United States Senator Robert Taft.

Taft disagreed with previous testimony given by Humphrey and certainly will disagree with the position taken by Weeks.

The facts are that a Republican Ohio mayor did more to advance the Eisenhower highway program, for which he has no responsibility, than the two responsible Cabinet officers put together.

The Sun-Telegraph and the other Hearst Newspapers regard it as of vital importance that the President again make his position clear and undo the damage done to a project in which he has a deep personal interest.

THE SHRIMP FISHERY OF THE GULF OF MEXICO

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, fishing for shrimp has become one of the major industries of Florida in recent years. Several thousands of our citizens who live in nearly every seaboard city in the State are engaged the year around in manning the vessels that catch the shrimp, in processing them for market, in distributing them to markets all over the country, and in supplying needed materials to the vessels and plants.

The fishery is an old one on both the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico sides of the State but it received a great impetus directly after the war when it was found that the so-called brown or pink shrimp which occasionally were found in the catches were abundant in deeper waters of the Gulf of Mexico than had theretofore been fished commercially. Not only were they abundant in these deeper waters but they were delicious and they found a quick and ready market in all parts of the United States. Under the impetus of this discovery the shrimp fishery has grown to be the most valuable sea fishery that the United States has, surpassing salmon some years ago and even becoming greater than tuna in the value of its landings last year.

To fish in these deeper waters whole new fleets of larger modern trawling vessels had to be built and financed from the catch. Their activities quickly spread out all over the high seas of the Gulf of Mexico wherever the bottom

and water conditions were suitable for fishing and for supporting the shrimp they sought. Rather quickly it was found that some of the best shrimping grounds were in the southern part of the gulf off the coast of Mexico in the Campeche, Tampico, and adjacent areas of the high seas. These were seas well known to Florida fishermen who had fished for red snapper in that area for several generations, and still do.

While it was American fishermen from Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas who discovered and proved up these shrimp fisheries of the southern gulf it was not long before Mexican fishermen began to participate in these offshore fisheries too, as often as not with vessels, capital, and business experience provided by American partners. Since there was little or no market at the time for shrimp in that part of Mexico most of the Mexican-caught shrimp was exported to markets in the United States as it still is.

The Mexican fishery in the area developed rapidly as did the American fishery and as they developed side by side friction grew, as it often does in such circumstances. Part of this was due to normal competition on the fishing grounds and in the market. It was a new, dynamic, pioneer fishery and excesses of exuberant spirits were present on both sides. Smoldering in the background was the century-old dispute between the United States and Mexico as to where the territorial sea left off and the free high seas began. Mexico and the Gulf States claimed that the territorial sea in the gulf was 9 marine miles in breadth; the Department of State replied as vigorously that the territorial seas of all parties in the gulf were 3 marine miles in breadth. Aiding and confusing such friction as arose over this issue were claims made by Argentina, Chile, and Peru to total sovereignty over 200 miles or more of ocean off their coasts. If they could make such extravagant claims why could not Mexico do so too and drive the Americans completely out of the Gulf of Mexico south of the Rio Grande?

There was continued friction on the fishing grounds, heated articles in the Mexican newspapers and, finally, seizure of American vessels which drew the immediate attention of the Congress and the Department of State. It also called for quick reaction from the American shrimpers themselves. If American fishermen were going to be forced out of the fishery they had developed they would seek to close this American market to the Mexican product. It would be tit for tat. In early 1950, when the serious problems began to flare, bills were introduced into the Congress for that purpose.

But as quickly as the serious trouble flared it began to die down. There were wise heads in the industry on both sides of the border and in the spring of 1950 they decided to get their heads together and devise ways and means to all stay in business profitably. There were shrimp enough for both groups of fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico if some patience could be found. There was

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 1, 1956
For actions of February 29, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 35

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....21	Food industries.....17	Personnel.....19
Advisory committees.....18	Foreign trade.....8	Postal rates.....12
Cheese.....6	Forestry.....2	Prices, support.....1,9,20
Conservation.....18	Holiday.....13	farm.....14
Cooperatives.....23	Imports.....14	Reclamation.....5,15,16
Disaster relief.....3	Information.....4	Roads.....7
Economic report.....10	Loans.....17,20	Soil bank.....9
Electrification.....11,23	Monopolies.....24	Surplus commodities.....15
Experiment stations.....22	Natural resources.....1	Taxation.....7
Farm program.....1,9		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate continued debate on farm bill. House continued debate on Colorado River storage project. Sen. Ellender introduced bill to authorize USDA to pay expenses of Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation. Rep. Christopher spoke favoring inclusion of 90 percent price support provision in soil-bank bill.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 3183, the farm bill. (pp. 3121, 3146)
Agreed to a unanimous-consent agreement that beginning on Thurs., Mar. 8, debate shall be limited to 2 hours on any amendment, motion, or appeal (except on motion to lay on table); that no nongermane amendment shall be received; that after all amendments have been disposed of, a motion shall be in order to consider H. R. 12, to which motion the same debate limitations shall apply as on any other amendment or motion; that after H. R. 12 is taken up it shall be deemed to be amended by substituting for its text the language of S. 3183, as amended; that if the motion to take up H. R. 12 does not carry, the Senate shall proceed to consider final passage of S. 3183 with debate thereon limited to 4 hours; and that in event of passage of H. R. 12, as amended, S. 3183 shall be deemed to be postponed indefinitely. pp. 3148, D175
Sens. Humphrey and Morse (for himself and Sens. Neuberger, Magnuson, and Murray) submitted amendments intended to be proposed to the bill. p. 3097
Sen. Capehart criticized a statement made by Sen. Kefauver in Iowa that higher interest rates are "the biggest increase in the expense on your farms." p. 3104
2. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Goldwater defended Secretary McKay against "giveaway charges," and inserted a number of newspaper articles on the matter. p. 3098

Sen. Neuberger charged that the decision of Secretary McKay to abandon the Hells Canyon power site poses a "threat to the fisheries, wildlife, and outdoor grandeur of the Pacific Northwest," and inserted a number of articles and statements on the subject. p. 3105

Sen. Humphrey spoke in favor of a national wilderness preservation system, including wilderness areas in the national forests, and inserted a number of excerpts from letters commenting on such a system. p. 3108

3. DISASTER INSURANCE. Sen. Lehman inserted a n American Municipal Assoc. resolution and letter urging Congress to develop a plan for natural disaster insurance. p. 3094

4. INFORMATION. Sen. Young inserted the results of a questionnaire on various subjects, including farm matters, which he had sent to residents of N. Dak. p. 3105

HCUSE

5. RECLAMATION. Continued debate on H. R. 3383, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project. p. 3160

Rep. Green, Ore., inserted a letter from the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources expressing opposition to a dam on the Clearwater River. p. 3159

Rep. Miller inserted quotations from the President's news conference favoring the Colorado River storage project. p. 3160

6. CHEESE. Rep. Zablocki discussed the merits of cheese produced in Wisconsin and noted favorably the present cheese products promotion. p. 3159

7. ROADS; TAXATION. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported with amendments H. R. 9075, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, trucks, and buses. p. 3178

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Philbin opposing the proposed plan which would authorize OTC regulatory powers over tariffs and foreign commerce and suggesting that Congress should carefully scan our entire foreign-trade relations. p. A1890

Rep. Williams, N.J., inserted the statement of the AFL-CIO executive council urging the establishment of the OTC. p. A1923

9. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Knutson criticizing the administration's farm program and inserting an article, "Why the Farmer Isn't Flourishing." p. A1893

Extension of remarks of Rep. Christopher favoring the inclusion of price supports at 90 percent in the soil bank bill, describing the provisions of "conservation reserve goal," and inserting a newspaper article, "The President's Soil-Bank Plan Doesn't Help the Ozarks." p. A1894

Sen. Martin inserted a newspaper article, "Get Politics Out of Farm Support Bill." p. A1900

10. ECONOMIC REPORT. Sen. Martin inserted Sen. Bricker's recent address on economic justice and stated that "I hope no Republican, by exaggerating the economic achievements of this administration, will subvert the ideal of economic justice." p. A1897

House for 60 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SIEMINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, at the time of rollcall No. 10 on yesterday, February 28, 1956, on House Resolution 311, granting a rule on the so-called Colorado River project, I was at the Pentagon Building with some industrialists of Evansville, Ind., who were anxious to procure contracts for Government defense work. There is a serious unemployment situation in Evansville and I was trying to assist them in order to relieve the unemployment situation there. As soon as the rollcall started, I left the Pentagon and attempted to reach the House in time to vote on this resolution. However, the traffic was such that I was unable to reach the House in time to vote.

If I had been present at the time, I would have voted "aye."

CLEARWATER DAM THREAT FORCES CONSERVATIONISTS TO HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a letter from the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources and a statement from that committee entitled "Clearwater Dam Threat Forces Conservationists to High Hells Canyon Dam."

Today when the House of Representatives is considering the upper Colorado River project it seems a fitting time to bring to the attention of the Members the importance of other multipurpose projects.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, D. C., February 28, 1956.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Just as soon as we have the Echo Park controversy settled, the administration appears bent upon starting another one like it. But if they insist on building dams on the Clearwater River they will certainly have the conservationists up in arms again.

Conservationists have been often accused of unreasonable opposition to power and reclamation projects, when in fact, conservationists have urged alternative sites or projects to protect the nonrestorable benefits of nature. The instant case is a classic demonstration of what conservationists have been urging again and again.

The High Hells Canyon Dam would fully develop a place ideal for power, water storage, etc.; a place that does not invade or destroy wilderness areas, parks, nor wildlife habitat. The administration has rejected this project. In its place is recommended a project, admittedly inadequate because of this underutilization, that would make other projects necessary, which in turn would damage severely wildlife and scenic beauty.

Just prior to leaving for the North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson gave an explanation of the conservationists' position, a copy of which is attached.

Sincerely,

SPENCER M. SMITH,
Secretary.

CLEARWATER DAM THREAT FORCES CONSERVATIONISTS TO HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

A major threat to important fish and wildlife resources of Idaho's Clearwater River, big tributary to the Snake River, has forced conservation leaders to ask for a reappraisal of the role of the controversial Hells Canyon dam site. This development was announced today by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

"We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private power interests," Dr. Gabrielson stated. "But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result."

The President's budget provides for a huge dam at Bruce Eddy, on the Clearwater, which joins the Snake River downstream from the Hells Canyon site, Dr. Gabrielson pointed out. An additional Clearwater dam is planned at Penny Cliffs with subsequent construction planned for the Salmon River, which joins the Snake between the Hells Canyon site and the Clearwater.

"Big dams on either the Clearwater or the Salmon," Dr. Gabrielson added, "would wipe out important fish spawning grounds, inundate many thousands of acres of forest land, and in addition destroy critical winter range for some of the country's finest elk and deer herds. It make little sense to reduce drastically the amount of water storage at Hells Canyon, where no important wildlife or scenic values are at stake, if this means the destruction of scenic and wildlife resources that the Nation could otherwise save for the enjoyment of present and future generations."

Dr. Gabrielson's statement continues: "The Army Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, and the Federal Power Commission have all made statements urging water development on the Clearwater, and plans are well advanced. With the Echo Park controversy out of the way, conservationists are now turning to protect natural resources from this new threat. They will need to act swiftly to block the Bruce Eddy Dam in the present session of Congress."

"Let me stress that this is not part of the public versus private power controversy, nor is it an attempt to prevent necessary flood control or power development. These needs can be met without jeopardy to important public values by intelligent use of other dam sites in the Columbia Basin. The kind of short-sighted planning that would allow the Clearwater and Salmon River Dams to be built can also lead to the building of Glacier View Dam, which would inundate an important part of Glacier National Park."

"No matter who builds on the acceptable sites, whether public or private agencies or a combination of both, these sites should be fully utilized. It is up to the Nation's citi-

zens to see that they are, and to require proof that there are no alternatives before considering irrevocable damage to our best scenic and wildlife resources."

KICK THE BUM OUT

(Mr. TUMULTY asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that last night one of our major television systems gave a program which was a farewell to ex-Dictator Peron, who left the United States-owned Washington Hotel in Panama, where he had had a three-room suite.

I invite your attention to the Chicago Daily News which carries a picture of his palatial residence, for him and his bodyguard.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that my honor was at stake. They referred to me anonymously, and said I was "one United States Congressman." I am here to reassert my honor. I feel I should more properly be referred to in the plural and I am going to serve notice on the TV network that I demand equal time, or in fact double time over their network; because if a dictator can get any of their time, a free citizen is entitled to twice as much time to give a freeman's version of why a dictator should have been thrown out and should have been kept out. I hope the Republic of Panama will see that he gets out of there. There should be no place in the Western Hemisphere for deposed dictators, who are aspiring to get back to power.

I said, "Throw the bum out." I say now, "Keep the bum out."

WISCONSIN CHEESE WEEK

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for over a century, the great State of Wisconsin has been known, among other things, for the unequalled excellence of its dairy products.

The fame of Wisconsin milk, cheese, and butter has spread throughout our Nation, and even reached foreign lands.

I am indeed proud and happy to note that the story of America's Dairyland will be presented vividly in our Nation's Capital during this week. It is this week that our State's dairy promotion campaign has reached Washington. It will move into Washington's retail and wholesale outlets, and endeavor to reach all of the local residents through the media of newspapers, radio, and television.

I understand that the campaign will be waged even on Capitol Hill, where our distinguished colleagues will be given a treat consisting of Wisconsin cheese.

Mr. Speaker, there are two chief reasons why I am particularly delighted about this promotional campaign: In the first place, because it will make many people happy by bringing delicious Wisconsin products to their notice; and, secondly, because it will, in the long run,

help to provide a broader market for Wisconsin dairy products, thereby helping to sustain our Wisconsin dairy farmer's income.

I hope that the Wisconsin Cheese Week, which opened yesterday, will enjoy every success.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning the following statement was made by President Eisenhower at his press conference, on the Colorado River project. This is unedited but essentially is what he said:

The other item of legislation which I am very deeply concerned about now is the upper Colorado Basin.

I have more than once expressed my conviction before, that I believe water is rapidly becoming our most valuable natural resource, and here is an opportunity, at last, to treat this whole great mighty Colorado River as a single entity, to treat it on a basin basis instead of merely local and individual. We should get busy and get on to it. There was one feature of it that was originally controversial because of the belief on the part of some conservationists we would destroy wildlife in one section of the area. That dam, Echo Park Dam, has been eliminated.

I think their fears were groundless but it has been eliminated and removed, that particular bone of contention. So again I hope that we can have positive action on that as rapidly as possible.

(The above is unedited and was dictated over phone by press section at the White House.)

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very happy day for the American people. They have every good cause to rejoice not only because President Eisenhower is willing to be a candidate for reelection but because they know that his decision is based upon his own sincere conviction that he can do so without undue risk to his health. I am certain that millions of Americans, as well as millions more in the free world, feel confident that their prayers for his recovery have been answered. I am equally certain that they now look forward with renewed hope and confidence as to the future of this country and of free men and women everywhere under the inspired leadership of one of our greatest Presidents.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we who know Dwight D. Eisenhower as both President and friend have been concerned, above all, with his recovery. We rejoice in the fact that he

is able to continue in the most demanding assignment in all the world.

As President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower has given new force and leadership to the principles of our way of life. His first concern always has been to advance the sacred rights of the individual and to make the Government of the United States ever more representative of all the people. We in America, and freemen throughout the world, can take heart that this man is willing to continue to lead us on to ever greater achievements.

It is his rare quality of complete frankness that endears him to us all which is evidencing itself in his determination to have the people of this great country know not only the facts about his recovery but also his thinking. Certainly no man in our history has so bared his soul. Let us who have prayed for his renewal thank God for his selfless readiness to carry the burdens of his great office for yet another term.

A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will make it short, Mr. Speaker. So many have referred to the President's announcement but they seem to have overlooked the fact that the President also said that he wants a Republican Congress. As a candidate, I am heartily in accord with that.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construction, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Andrews	Gary	Ryce, Tenn.
Ayres	George	Richards
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Scrivner
Boykin	Hope	Shelley
Byrd	Jenkins	Spence
Celler	Knutson	Staggers
Chatham	Lankford	Teague, Tex.
Dodd	McDowell	Tollefson
Dorn, S. C.	Madden	Watts
Eberharter	Osmer	Wharton
Fascell	Powell	Williams, Miss.
Fountain	Priest	Young
Gamble	Rains	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Without objection further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask why we are asked to come in at 11 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. ENGLE. Because we are trying to finish this bill this week.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that it will take from 11 o'clock tomorrow morning through tomorrow and Friday?

Mr. ENGLE. It will take until 6 o'clock tonight just to finish general debate. I believe there are 3 hours and 3 minutes left of general debate. Then the bill must be read under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may state for the information of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] that after the bill we are now considering, there will be an appropriation bill; and there are two other bills from the Committee on Armed Services. All those come under the program for this week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether it is proposed to meet on Friday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless this legislation and the other referred to are disposed of; the appropriation bill and the two bills out of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the House should not meet on Friday. I object.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3383.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] had 1 hour and 28 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] had 1 hour and 38 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasant task that I have to disagree with such eminent Members of Congress as the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. ENGLE] for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. I have had a great many friendly contacts with the ranking Member on the Democratic side, my good friend WAYNE ASPINALL, and I regret that I find myself in disagreement with him. I also have, I hope, on the Republican side a number of good friends, including the ranking Member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and I regret that I find it necessary to disagree with him.

No later than an hour ago you heard read here on the floor of the House a statement that the President of the United States is also in favor of this project. Despite this fact, I must oppose this project and all that it represents, because I honestly and sincerely believe that it is not in the best interest of all of the people of our country. I hope that I have approached this project not from a partisan standpoint, nor a local viewpoint, but rather from a broad national scope.

The upper basin States should be allowed to put the water allotted to them under the Colorado River compact to beneficial consumptive use in a feasible project. Therefore in view of my beliefs the statement I am about to make I know should startle you, but I say to you in all sincerity that it is true. There is not a word of testimony in all the pages that have been taken before the committees of the House or the Senate that says that the bill before you, and upon which you are going to be asked to vote, is a feasible project. The fact of the matter is that all of the testimony that has been offered by the Bureau of Reclamation is in direct contradiction of this project's feasibility and therefore I ask you to vote against it.

You will recall that last year from all sections of every Congressional District you were besieged by letters from people that were worried because it was planned by the Bureau of Reclamation to invade a national monument in the upper Colorado River storage and participating projects. You have now been told by the proponents of this present measure and others who have spoken in favor of the bill presently before you that the invasion of Echo Park has been eliminated and, therefore, you should vote for the bill. But if you are to vote for a bill, you should vote for one that has the economically feasible factors that would make it pay out. With the elimination of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams from the project and the failure to substitute an alternate site or sites this project cannot earn sufficient funds. The uncontroverted testimony of Mr. Tudor, the Under Secretary of the Interior in 1954 before the House committee, is as follows:

If Echo Park is eliminated in would certainly put the project in hazard. * * * The alternative would be to increase the rate for power, and we are getting up pretty high as it is, so that power is not competitive with any other means.

The Interior Department has not told any committee that they have refigured the project to substitute an alternate site or to increase the rates for power. The proponents have told you they have taken out Echo Park. However they have not informed you of any alternate site or increased power rates. They have taken out the only thing that will make this project self-sustaining—under the fantastic provisions which are included in the bill, and therefore I charge that when you vote for this bill under these circumstances you are voting to invade our national parks and monuments.

Mr. Tudor's statement has not been contradicted. There has never been a witness to appear before any Congressional committee who has challenged the correctness of his statement or said that Mr. Tudor was wrong. There has never been a man up here representing any branch of the Government, before any committee of the Congress who has come up and said to any committee that this project can work if the Echo Park Dam is taken out of the bill. Yet, the proponents of this piece of legislation have now come to you with the fantastic proposition that it can pay for itself.

When our committee reported this bill out last year it was an entirely different bill. It could have been defended. However, after this session started we had a meeting of the committee and there was offered the bill that is presently before you. It received no hearings, no official report from any department, nor was any reason for the changes given.

This is the bill that you will be asked to vote upon. The committee met for 2 hours and we heard the matter discussed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] but he had absolutely no evidence to substantiate it other than the statements which he made. As I stated in the beginning—I have a great deal of respect for Mr. ASPINALL's integrity, but after all, he comes from the area. He has a very personal interest in this. It does not make any difference to me as far as my area is concerned, except that I do not want to burden my constituents with needless taxes to support a project that will not work. I am not personally interested in the Colorado River either upstream or downstream. But as one who is interested in the future of America, one who is interested in developing all sections of our country by sound means and methods, as a true friend of reclamation I warn you that to vote in favor of this present project and pass this bill, you will be voting in favor of a project which from the testimony of all departments, will not work.

The second point I want to bring out is the project, as presently planned, does not comply with the general reclamation law. The present law requires repayment within 40 years with respect to power and municipal water plus a development period not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation. Under this bill, the power allocation is permitted to be repaid within 100 years. No other project has ever been presented to this Congress or any other Congress has had

that kind of provision in it. This provision exceeds by 50 years the pattern used in all other power repayment contracts and is not in accord with good engineering practices. The municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit. The irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid within 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law. Thus, the repayment period for power produced by this project is extended 60 years; the repayment period for municipal water is extended 10 years; and the irrigation repayment will be extended at least 10 years, plus an undetermined period over existing law because of the changes being made. Present reclamation law requires interest at "not less than 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

If you believe that this statement is an exaggeration let me quote from an interview with Robert LeRoy Cochran, who recently retired from the United States Bureau of the Budget, after long and honorable service as an expert on financial and engineering aspects of Federal water conservation projects:

Question. Governor Cochran, since the great majority of the readers of this article are interested in the Colorado River storage project as taxpayers rather than as beneficiaries, I believe they would like to have your opinion concerning the possibility of repayment to the Treasury of the money spent for power and irrigation. What is the formula proposed by the Interior Department for repayment?

Answer: It is called the Colbrann formula. It proposes that the power features be paid off first, with interest, from the revenues from the sale of electricity. After those expenditures are liquidated, which it is estimated will take about 50 years, the power profits would be used to pay off the costs of irrigation aspects of the plan. Such repayment, if ever made, would take considerably more than another half century.

Question. What is your opinion about the practical prospects of repayment?

Answer. According to the claims of the Bureau of Reclamation and the congressional sponsors of the project, the cashboxes from which most of the repayment must come are power installations, the largest of which is Glen Canyon, near the Utah-Arizona border. On the basis of the figures submitted, only Glen Canyon could be justified as financially feasible. Even if the revenues from that one dam were as good as anticipated, they would be entirely consumed in paying the deficits on the other power dams. That would leave nothing at all for the repayment of the irrigation costs during the first 50-year period.

The analysis presented by the Department was based upon a 50-year period, generally considered to be the useful life of a project. Such a period may be too long in the light of the future potentials of power production from atomic energy and other sources.

Question. How then could the costs of the irrigation aspects of the upper Colorado project be paid back to the Federal Government?

Answer. A small proportion (about 15 percent) of the construction costs alone would be repaid by the farmers during the first interest-free 50 years. While it is proposed that the balance (85 percent) be paid back out of the revenues of the power aspects of the plan, we have already seen that there

is no validity in that claim. Payment from that source would not begin anyhow until after about 50 years. By that time, the power features might well be obsolete. It should be emphasized that there appears to be a very serious doubt as to whether any power revenues would ever be applied to the payment of irrigation costs in the upper Colorado Basin. I submit that a proposal to start payment after 50 years on a debt for any purpose is not worth the paper it is written on.

Meanwhile, because of the high construction costs per acre of the irrigation works and the accumulating unpaid interest, the Federal subsidy would be enormous. Under the ultraliberal construction of the reclamation law by the Department, freedom from interest extends not only through the 40 or 50 years beyond a development period, but indefinitely into the future.

Something like 90 percent of the irrigation costs (including interest) would be Federal subsidy. Besides, experience with reclamation projects indicates that after 30 years or so it is necessary in a considerable number of cases to spend further money on rehabilitation. This is another large item of expense for the Federal Government. There is also the fact that there is pending in Congress a proposal to subsidize a soil bank of land now under production. We are faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

Question. But proponents of the upper Colorado storage project, ignoring the fact that in humid or semihumid sections of the country there are millions of acres which might with relatively small cost be prepared for cultivation, say that new irrigated land will be necessary by 1975 because of the rapidly increasing population in the United States. What about that argument for bringing new irrigated land into cultivation?

Answer. Such a claim must be balanced against the fact that through technology increased production can be and is being obtained from fewer acres. It will be very many years, if ever, before such land as is proposed in this project could be needed.

I would conclude that if Congress proposes to pay this immense subsidy to bring this arid land into production, it should be done in the open. As it is, the subsidy is pretty well concealed by means of a repayment formula which is absolutely without validity.

The Members who have spoken to you in favor of this bill would have you believe that the various agencies and bureaus of the Government who have examined it have approved it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] yesterday endeavored to have his questions answered, and it was only with a great deal of difficulty and with some reluctance on behalf of the proponents that he was able to get any answers to his questions. But I can say to you that the bill which has passed the other body, and the bill that was reported out of our committee to the House, and upon which you are now being asked to vote, has never been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The administration recommended two storage units at Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating projects at an actual estimated cost of \$930 million. The House bill authorizes four storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti and the Navajo 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also has a section which I say is tantamount to advance commitment by Congress, for 23 additional reclamation units to bring it up

to the same bill which passed the Senate, S. 500.

The Bureau of Reclamation definitely recommended against the authorization at this time of the storage units Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. In addition, the letter which was received from the Bureau of the Budget stating the administration's views, recommended that the legislation it provide authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditional and only authorized on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements with reports submitted to the Congress on each project, and with the new studies of direct agricultural benefits made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

In other words, even the study of direct benefits about which you have heard so much should be made jointly not by just the Department of the Interior but the Department of the Interior in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture.

This bill upon which you are going to be asked to vote favorably has three of the storage projects, namely Flaming Gorge, Curecanti and Navaho which have been definitely recommended against, and the 11 participating projects which are included are authorized completely. You will never have another chance to come back and take a look at them as the Bureau of the Budget asked; and I can say to you that despite what some of the advocates of this bill say, some of you Members will have it come back to haunt you because the 23 other participating projects which are conditionally authorized will be authorized in the final version and you will never have a chance to get another look at them.

Another phase of this bill that I would like to have you consider is that of bringing a half million acres of land under cultivation to produce crops already in surplus.

I have heard some Members who are in favor of this bill say that it will not come into production for a long time, that it will perhaps be as much as 27 years before these projects come into production. The advocates of this project had better get together with some of the Members of the Senate who have already voted upon this. I do not know whether they felt that the people who were over on this side were not interested in what was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or whether or not we do not care, or would swallow what somebody told to us. I have the greatest respect for the Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON, and I have not heard anybody say that the statement which he put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was inaccurate. You will find that he placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of the 33 projects which will be authorized under the Senate bill (S. 500), and here is what his own figures show: That 23 out of the 33 projects will come into production anywhere from 3 to 10 years; 2 will come into production in 11 years, 1 in 12; 1 in 13; 1 in 14; 1 in 15; 1 in 17; 1 in 26; and 1 in 27 years.

There is no duplication in the participating projects which are included in the bill you are presently considering except that they are divided into two sections of this bill. Of the 11 that are included in one section of this bill 3 will come into production in 8 years, 2 in 9; 2 in 10; 1 in 11; 1 in 13; 1 in 17; and the last in 26 years. Of the 22 projects, included in the other section 15 will come into production in 3 to 10 years; 1 in 11 years; 1 in 12 years; 2 in 14 years; 1 in 15 years; and 1 in 27 years.

And then this remarkable factor that you have been told about by those in favor of this bill, the great diversification of agriculture and how all these crops are going to be grown without creating any surplus, that it will be devoted to small crops, row crops, fruits, vegetables, and things of that character. The former Secretary of Agriculture put in a statement of just what is going to happen. He says there will be placed into production in new acreage 270,000 acres of land under that bill. The remaining land is already being dry farmed, but will be put under irrigation and its crop production boosted skyward. He asked the Department of Agriculture to give him a report on what could be grown if this actually comes under cultivation and this is what the Department of Agriculture reported to him: 50,000 acres will be put in oats, 50,000 acres will be put in barley, 105,000 acres will be placed in alfalfa and 65,000 acres will be placed in irrigated pasture. Now, I have not heard anybody contradict the former Secretary of Agriculture, a great proponent of this piece of legislation. It appears from what the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] said and what some of the rest of us have maintained that the proponents of this bill talk out of both sides of their mouth. They try to tell you on the one hand it will not create surpluses, then in fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they put in what will be grown and they clearly show that what will be grown is now in surplus will continue to be in surplus.

In a recent article, Raymond Moley, a real student of this problem, is most clear and interesting on this subject. Mr. Moley's article is as follows:

In the President's state of the Union message, separated by only a few sentences are two recommendations: "I shall urge authorization of a soil-bank program to alleviate the problem of diverted acres and an over-extended agricultural plant" and "I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryngpan-Arkansas project."

This means that the President is asking Congress to take out of cultivation an immense number of acres at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers, and on the other hand to bring into cultivation or to increase the productivity of over a million acres at a cost in the upper Colorado project of as high as \$5,000 an acre and in the Fryngpan-Arkansas project of about \$1,400 an acre.

This continues the mad cycle which has been going on for years: The Agriculture Department laboring to curb production, and the Interior Department just as zealously trying to increase production. Of course, this makes no sense. But lots of things in

politics make no sense and are paid out of the sweat of the taxpayer's brow.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the gigantic upper Colorado project was presented to Congress by the administration and the Hoover Commission was setting to work to look into all and sundry water-conservation projects, the President appointed a committee on the general subject, composed of Secretary McKay, Chairman, and the Secretaries Benson and Wilson. This committee has just submitted its report.

In the first place, the report recommends that State and local governments should share the cost of water projects. But the President in his message recommends that the two projects named above be wholly Federal.

Next, the committee recommends that there be set up an independent Board of Review * * * to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President. If any such board were to report independently and factually on these two projects, it can be taken for granted that no President would dream of recommending them. As it happened, the pressure for these projects came from interested Members of Congress and bureaucrats anxious to spend more and more tax dollars. The congressional committees that considered them are stacked with members from beneficiary States. In the case of the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 500), only one member came from east of the Mississippi, and he represents a State paying a relatively small percentage of the taxes involved. One might as well have a plaintiff pick the jury which would pass upon his claim.

The other notable recommendation is that while the old practice of charging water users on irrigation projects no interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government should be continued, nevertheless interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost. This means that when a project is presented to Congress, all the cards would be laid on the table. Hitherto the interest charge has been one of those things that the interested parties never chose to mention. Only occasionally a stalwart champion of economy has cried that cost out of the Bureau of Reclamation.

That interest charge is very important. Since no project except 1 or 2 has been paid for by the water users within the 53 years since Federal irrigation began, the interest charge runs to twice to three times the original cost.

Immediately after the President made the report public, a Congressman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, shouted his disapproval and in so doing let a cat as big as a mountain puma out of the bag. He said that "if they did not favor the elimination of the interest charge immediately after adding it to the cost of construction, there wouldn't be a reclamation project in the United States that would be economically possible."

In short, if the real cost plus interest were considered, none of the presently proposed irrigation projects would stand scrutiny.

That is exactly what I have been saying in this space for 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. One of the proponents of this bill stated there would only be 120,000 acres brought in production. Another one said 140,000 acres would be brought into production. Evidently there is twice that much will be brought in.

Mr. SAYLOR. No one has challenged Senator ANDERSON's statement showing there will be brought into production

new land to the extent of 270,000 acres. They have not tried to challenge it because they know it is true.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has talked about what is going to happen out here. Was the gentleman present at a committee hearing when Mr. J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General, testified that we have built projects out there in the West costing \$150 million and did not have any water to put behind those dams?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman also inform the House whether or not he also testified that he and his department were then defending approximately 40 or 50 suits in other parts of the Western States?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct, defending suits for water and there is no water there.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call one other factor to the attention of the members of the committee. That is, the slightly inconsistent position which the various Departments of Government have taken. We are now being asked to vote upon a bill which will bring into production according to the figures given by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico at least 270,000 acres of new land. The cost will be approximately \$5,000 an acre.

The Department of Agriculture within a week or so will come up here asking us to vote for a soil bank to take land out of production.

The President just a few years ago appointed a Water Policy Board consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense. Those three men presented to the American public a new water policy. It is strange to relate this present project, which will be the biggest project this administration or any other administration can ever ask you to pass upon, was not included. This does not comply with the provisions of the President's Water Policy Board.

If ever a piece of water-resources legislation cried for processing under the procedures the Presidential Advisory Committee recommends, this is it. This would involve an application of benefit-cost principles which would give a more realistic appraisal of the benefits and detriments of this project; and ultimate review by an independent board of review which should give the Congress a correct picture of the highly controverted engineering and financial details of the proposal.

Compare just two of the statements of the Presidential Advisory Committee with the facts of this project:

(1) Use of excess revenues:

The Committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which

such excess revenues are derived. However, it should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenue to aid projects which are in no way related to the facility producing the excess revenues amounts in reality to the operation of a Government facility to obtain a profit to be used for other purposes, and there are obvious limits beyond which such a policy cannot be justified (Rept. pp. 33-34).

The participating projects to be benefited by the anticipated power revenues are connected in no other way with the power dams. Each one of these irrigation ventures could be constructed without the storage dams. No water impounded by these dams is to be placed on the land. Yet, 88 percent of the cost of these irrigation projects is expected to be repaid from power revenues. If such a percentage does not exceed obvious limits, what would? The precedent in this bill would be so enormous for this type of subsidy that we may as well forget a national water policy on this score.

(2) Payment of interest:

The Committee recommends that as a general policy interest be paid on all Federal investment subject to repayment. In making this recommendation, the Committee recognizes that the provision of interest-free Federal funds for irrigation does not conform to this policy. The Committee believes, however, that this provision should not be eliminated but rather that interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost, as should all nonreimbursable items in all projects (report, p. 34).

The Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that the project recommended by the Secretary—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams and 11 participating projects—would result in a total interest cost of \$1,153 million in the year 2032.

This staggering figure has been variously estimated by other sources to run as high as \$4 billion, depending on which of the many overall project plans may be under consideration. In any event, consider the Bureau figure as a minimum. This is not included as a project cost as the Presidential Advisory Committee now recommends. It was brought out only by determined questioning. It gives some idea of the true cost of the project to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that in view of my statement and that of other sincere opponents of this bill you will, when the time comes, recommit it to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The testimony which was just given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] was to Senate bill 500, was it not?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Yes; it was. Mr. ASPINALL. It was not to the bill before this body.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am for the so-called natural resources features in this bill. I had a bill to make the Dinosaur National Monument made into a national park in the 83d Congress. I would like to present another such bill so that for all time this ground would be a national park, which could only be changed or extinguished by an act of Congress and the President's approval.

Further, I consider as an important contribution of the substitute bill the amendments providing protection for the national parks and monuments. I am confident that the Bureau of Reclamation can work out acceptable ways of developing water for the States of the upper basin without trespassing upon any national park or monument.

I am also now introducing the bill I formerly submitted to make the Dinosaur National Monument a national park.

Now I wish to submit some remarks on the bill as a whole and point out what I consider conspicuous weaknesses and fallacies in comments on the bill now before us.

We in northern California fully realize and appreciate the value of the reclamation program. Also we do not begrudge sharing its benefits with other States.

In our own area we have seen semi-desert areas blossom after the construction of the great Central Valley project. We expect to see still more of these areas become fruitful after the completion of Trinity and the Sacramento Canals.

From our own experience we know these costs have been worthwhile, and that, because of these Federal investments in large part, California can support its ever-increasing population in the national interest.

We have also seen how the power and water users together can repay the Federal Government for its capital investment. These same principles are contained in the bill we are considering.

I have been particularly interested in the variable cost figures used by the opponents of the project. I want to say a few words about these figures.

The Bureau of Reclamation has testified that the costs of the 11 participating projects would range from \$210 per acre for the La Barge project in Wyoming to \$794 per acre for the central Utah project.

These figures represent a cost of \$4.20 to \$16 per acre each year for an assured water supply. To me these costs are moderate. About 2 weeks ago we approved a bill authorizing the Ventura project at a cost of \$1,800 per acre, according to the same Bureau's figures. I did not hear a word of protest at that time.

The figures used by the opponents of the Colorado River storage project bill leave me both puzzled and confused. I do not pretend to be an Einstein, but I can do ordinary arithmetic.

On page 30 of the original minority report, the opponents say the project costs will be \$3,000 to \$5,000 per acre.

On page 31, the average construction cost is given as \$750 to \$900 per acre.

On page 35, the concealed subsidy is first given as \$3,150 per acre. Later on the same page Federal subsidies are said to amount to \$3,000 to \$5,000 per acre.

On page 36, the direct irrigation investment is first given as \$200 to nearly \$800. Then later on the same page the average direct investment is said to be \$750 to \$900.

On page 50, the figure is given correctly at last—\$210 to \$794 per acre.

The opponents' supplemental minority report is no more reliable. On page 16 the hidden subsidy is said to be \$5,000 per acre. Yet on the same page the irrigation investment is stated to be \$750 to \$900.

Frankly, I just cannot make sense out of the opponents' figures. I do not see any alternative to accepting the Reclamation Bureau's figures, which were good enough to authorize the Ventura project and the Trinity project during this Congress.

It is apparent to me that the opponents of this bill like to charge all the costs of the storage dams to the irrigation project when it suits their purpose, then add some Houdini compound interest figures to that.

The Colorado River compact apportions water to all the people of the four upper States. They cannot use their water without regulation to satisfy their obligations to the people of the lower basin.

These storage dams will make that regulation possible. It would be most unfair to charge these storage costs to the 11 irrigation projects in this bill. These dams will make it possible for all the upper basin towns, industries, and farmers to use the upper basin's share of the river without encroaching on the lower basin. These regulatory dams are for the general benefit of all the States of the basin, even if no additional irrigation project were ever authorized by the Congress.

I consider this project to be a worthwhile addition to the Federal reclamation program.

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in 10 minutes' time obviously I will not be able to answer all of the statements made by my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], but very briefly I would like to call 1 or 2 matters to his attention. He has talked about people speaking out of both sides of their mouths before our committee and that there has been no one before our committee who would go for this project, any so-called expert, with Echo Park Dam out.

Now, for the gentleman's information, I have the statement here of an expert that he might be interested in. This is taken from the committee hearings in 1954, on page 780, quoting the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and here is what he says:

I certainly hope to live to see the time when the upper Colorado River storage project will be built up outside of Echo Park and Split Mountain.

In other words, the gentleman was for the project if we would take these two dams out; so I submit that for the RECORD.

Now, another matter before I get into my main talk, and I want to refer to some of the items that were inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], in which a list of names was submitted of organizations who oppose this project. Among the various organizations as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were a number of railroad brotherhoods. In fact, there were some 150 organizations, most of whom were from southern California, with the exception of these few that were placed at the top of the list. Now, I took occasion yesterday to send wires to these union organizations who are listed, according to the gentleman, as opposing the upper Colorado project, and I have in my hand replies from these various organizations. Out of 9 brotherhoods that were reported as being opposed, according to the RECORD of yesterday, I have wires back from 7 of them, and you might be interested in them.

The first is from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and they state:

Your wire 28th: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has not taken a stand on upper Colorado storage project.

That was signed by H. E. Gilbert, national president, Cleveland, Ohio.

The gentleman also says that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is opposed to the upper Colorado project. I have in my hand a wire which arrived this morning from W. P. Kennedy, national president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and he states:

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen on record supporting upper Colorado River storage project.

I also have in my hand a report from the conductors and brakemen's organization who are listed by the gentleman from California as opposing this project, and Mr. W. D. Johnson, vice president, states in this wire:

Your telegram of February 28 to Mr. R. O. Hughes, president, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, referred to me for reply. This to advise our order has remained neutral in connection with upper Colorado River storage project.

The same applies to the representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks who are listed as opposing the project. They state in the wire which arrived today:

Our organization has never taken any position on the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress.

The gentleman also says that the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen is opposed to this, and I have a wire from the president of the carmen's organization:

In reply to your inquiry regarding the upper Colorado River storage project the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America has taken no stand nationally and neither favors nor opposes this legislation.

The same applies to the railroad telegraphers who say they have taken no position on this project, and the same applies to the Brotherhood of Signalmen.

I refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday in which all of these organizations are listed as having opposed this project, and we have these wires saying they support it or have taken no stand. At this point I desire to submit the wires for the RECORD:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, February 28, 1956.
The Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire 28th: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has not taken a stand on upper Colorado River storage project.

H. E. GILBERT,
National President.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, February 29, 1956.
The Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel 28th: Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen on record supporting upper Colorado River storage project.

W. P. KENNEDY,
National President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 29, 1956.
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of February 28 to Mr. R. O. Hughes, president, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, referred to me for reply. This to advise our order has remained neutral in connection with upper Colorado River storage project.

W. D. JOHNSON,
Vice President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 29, 1956.
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Retel 28th: Our organization has never taken any position on the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress.

HARTMAN BARBER,
General Representative,
Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 29, 1956.
Congressman DAWSON of Utah,
House Office Building:

In reply to your inquiry regarding the upper Colorado River storage project, the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America has taken no stand nationally and neither favors nor opposes this legislation.

IRVIN L. BARNEY,
The National Legislative Representative.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., February 29, 1956.
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wire 28th: The Order of Railroad Telegraphers has taken no position on upper Colorado River storage project.

G. E. LEIGHTY.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 28, 1956.
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Retel today: Our organization has not taken a stand nationally on the upper Colorado River storage project.

JEFFE CLARK,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad
Signal Men of America.

I leave it to you, my colleagues, to determine who is giving you the facts in regard to this matter. I wish I had more time to go in detail into the matters

raised by my friend from Pennsylvania, but I simply remind you that when he says that the Bureau of the Budget has not given approval to this project, you should be reminded that the Bureau of the Budget is directly under the President and the President of the United States, no more than 4 hours ago, made the statement that he approved this project and urged the Congress to pass this measure. I think that is sufficient. We do not need to go much beyond that.

I would like, in the short time that remains, to discuss with you some of the reasons why this project is so important not only to the West but to the entire Nation.

The Almighty has blessed our land with rich, natural resources. But the happiness and well-being of our people and the stature, strength, and wealth of our Nation all depend upon the degree of use and development of those resources. That this Nation stands first in the world is not due to the chance development of an atomic or nuclear bomb, the superiority of our aircraft engineers, or the richness our deep, black soil. We are first because men of vision have planned and built for the needs of tomorrow. We are great because this type of man has anticipated our needs and has succeeded in developing our natural resources to an extent—and with a speed—unequaled in any place else in the world.

A vast amount of this development came about through the initiative of men operating within the framework of private enterprise. An equally large amount of our Nation's development, however, was either done in partnerships with the Government or by the Federal Government alone. The transcontinental railroad which held a then-scattered Nation together with bands of steel was a joint venture made possible only through the grants to the railroads of large segments of the public domain. Highways which have cemented the States into a Union were Government developments. So was the Panama Canal and other major dredging operations that made our rivers highways of commerce. More recently our Government recognized in uncaptured falling water a resource—a renewable resource—of extreme value to the Nation as a whole. Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and hundreds of lesser structures stand as sound, self-liquidating monuments to the men in and out of Government who recognized this resource and conserved it for the betterment of the people.

But we should be reminded that this Nation has not made these great achievements through the accomplishments of our engineers and scientists alone, great as they may be. The planes that won World War II were built from aluminum refined with power from Grand Coulee and assembled in southern California by power from Hoover Dam and similar dams on the Colorado River. Yet when these dams came up for authorization before Congress, opponents claimed there would never be a market for the power they would produce. Grand Coulee Dam was labeled by its opponents "The white elephant of the Colum-

bia River," and yet today after these great projects have been placed in operation, the Pacific Northwest is already suffering from power shortages.

The upper Colorado River storage project is now before you. This project has been the object of one of the heaviest financed—and I say, most distorted—attacks ever leveled at any single piece of legislation. I do not intend at this time to go into the reasons for southern California's opposition to this vital, national development. Nor do I intend—at this time—to answer all of their ridiculous charges. Let me say at this time, however, that the upper Colorado River storage project is not being sponsored by all Members of Congress from four rich but arid States for the purpose of putting landowners on Pike's Peak in the banana-raising business.

This project is more than the usual reclamation project. It is a long-range, multipurpose, self-liquidating development of an entire river basin—a river basin that drains one-twelfth of the land area of the United States and from the standpoint of mineral and metal wealth, the richest area in the Nation.

The project will store up the water now needed for municipal purposes and now going to waste in the Gulf of California. It will store up industrial water needed for development of the area's raw materials. The water now goes to waste in the Gulf of California. The project will generate power for use of the area's expanding industries—power now lost to the Nation in the present undeveloped stage. In all instances, the cost of municipal, industrial water and power production will be repaid to the Federal Government with interest.

What do these four States now contribute to the wealth of the Nation, and what additional resources can they contribute with the power and water furnished by this development?

Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado, along with Arizona and Nevada, produced in 1954 86.6 percent of the Nation's newly mined copper. This copper—having the value of half a billion dollars per year—is the raw material from which payrolls are made in our eastern and midwestern industrial areas. Continued development of our copper resources depends upon an expanding water supply.

The four upper basin States and Arizona produce nearly 100 percent of the Nation's uranium ore. Continued expansion of uranium mining and milling facilities depends upon more water.

Oil-shale deposits cover more than 4 million acres in 4 States of the upper Colorado River Basin. One formation alone has enough oil shale to produce 100 billion barrels of oil—more than twice as much as has been produced from wells to date in this Nation. Part of these valuable shales have been reserved for the future needs of the Navy. Water and power from the upper Colorado River project are necessary if these reserves are ever to be used.

The world's largest known deposits of phosphate are found in Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and Idaho. Water and power

from the Colorado River are needed if these national resources are to be developed.

All but a few of the basic materials required for a chemical industry are found in the four States of the upper basin. With these basic raw materials and with water and power, this Nation can maintain chemical independence. The development of the upper Colorado River project will provide the necessary water and power and the States now have the raw materials.

The presence of these and other mineral resources in the four States has brought about a rapid development of new industries. These industries are not developed at the expense of established industries elsewhere. They are new because the products manufactured or refined are new. The construction of a cobalt refining plant in Utah, for example, does not hurt industries elsewhere. It aids them as it adds its output to the wealth of the Nation. The cobalt plant was built because a domestic supply of cobalt was found and developed in the area.

Each of the four States has a limit of development beyond which it cannot go. This limit is set by the amount of water it can store and use. The area has an annual average rainfall of less than 12 inches per year. Everything that grows—lawns, crops, flowers, vegetables—must be artificially watered by man. Our last remaining source of water is that now flowing to waste in the Gulf of California. This wasted water of the Colorado River was allocated by compact to us nearly 35 years ago.

Last and greatest, we have human resources. Population in these four States is growing at twice the rate of our national population growth. More young men and women are graduating from our high schools and colleges and the rate will continue to increase. The availability of employment in the area for these people depends upon new industry, which in turn depends upon more water.

We people of these four States are eager to unlock this treasure chest of mineral wealth and share its richness with the Nation. In order to do this we must capture and use our water which is now wasting into the sea. The upper Colorado River storage project is the key to the chest.

I mentioned before the opposition to the project from southern California—and that is the source of the opposition. I know there have been occasional newspaper editorials against the project in some smaller newspapers throughout the Nation. These editorials have been based on false information and in checking we always find that the information has been distributed by southern California spokesmen. Southern California wants to maintain the status quo. The campaign against this project shows how far they will go to prevent our four States from ever using our water and power resources.

What is the status quo? And why is southern California opposing any change? Members of this body today are asked to choose between developing a four-State area or letting things go

along as they are now. Southern California has a selfish reason to oppose this legislation. Southern California now benefits from power produced by water allocated to the upper basin States. This power is sold at dump-power rates. After generating power, our water either flows to the sea or is—in increasing amounts—used by Mexico to increase her cotton production. Does Congress want to put the lid on the growth of four States in order to continue to subsidize power rates to a few dump-load customers in southern California, like the California-Edison Co. and permit our water to flow on to the sea or to Mexico? Will the ever-increasing cotton production in Mexico bring more long-range benefits to this Nation than the development of this vast and rich four-State area in our own land?

In the beginning, I said that a nation's strength depends upon the use it makes of its resources. The United States is first in the world because it has since its beginning developed its natural resources wisely and rapidly to meet its needs.

We hear a lot, these days, about intercontinental missiles. We compare our progress in nuclear weapons with that of the Soviet Union. We wonder if we are keeping abreast of the Communists in development of strategic bombers. We should, of course. Our safety depends upon it.

But the manufactured weapons of war and defense, in quality and amount, depends upon the development and wise use of the Nation's resources. We continually receive reports on the progress of the Soviet Union in harnessing nuclear power. How is our international rival progressing in development of its national resources—particularly its renewable resources such as falling water? From the best information available to us, it is apparent that the Soviet Union is making giant strides in harnessing its rivers and streams for the generation of hydroelectric power. Let me quote from an article by Paul Wohl on Soviet development, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 1, 1956.

Referring to U. S. S. R.'s current 5-year plan and its goals, Mr. Wohl writes:

One of the big tasks of the current plan is to provide for the equipment and the power to utilize this mineral wealth. With this

purpose in mind giant machines of all kinds are to be built, among them heavy presses which can turn out parts for cyclotrons as well as armament and are said to be capable of pressing a whole wing of a fighter plane in a single operation; excavator dredges large enough to load 2 large American-size freight cars with 1 shovel full, and machines for diffusion installations and for the turbines and boilers of projected thermo-power generating stations operating at a steam pressure up to 300 atmospheres and a temperature of 1,200°.

These extremely efficient machines, which take about 3 years to build, represent an investment of billions of rubles. Some of them are unequalled even in the United States.

POWER ARRAY

They will be served by an extraordinary array of power stations, including 2 stations of 3,200,000 kilowatts capacity each, 1 on the Angara and the other on the Yenissei River (Grand Coulee, up to now the world's largest station has a capacity short of 2 million kilowatts).

The power giant on the Angara River near Lake Baikal is to be partly completed and is to begin to operate before December 1960; the other one near Krasnoyarsk in west Siberia will be in construction at the end of the current plan.

Altogether the Soviets intend to take into operation during the current 5-year period waterpower capacity equal to nearly one-quarter of United States waterpower capacity existing in 1953.

At my request, the Library of Congress searched Soviet publications in order to get some picture of the progress of the Communists in construction of hydroelectric generating facilities since the war. The survey was prepared by Mr. John K. Rose, senior specialist in natural resources, and Sergius Yakobson, senior specialist in international affairs. It, too, reveals that the Soviet Union has adopted a crash program of harnessing its rivers.

I herewith submit a tabulation of hydroelectric projects constructed or under construction in the Soviet Union since the conclusion of World War II. In all probability, this tabulation is incomplete. The installed generating capacity for which we have definite figures in kilowatts totals 8,217,000 kilowatts. To this should be added the capacity of those undisclosed—but large. An analysis of the description of these projects would indicate that an additional 4 million kilowatts is under construction in U. S. S. R., bringing its total new hydro-generating capacity to more than 12 million since World War II.

Soviet Union hydroelectric projects completed or under construction since World War II

Project name	Status	Installed generating capacity
Tsimlyanskaya Dam.....	Completed April 1953.....	160,000 kilowatts.
Svir' upper dam.....	Began 1936; still under construction 1952.....	160,000 kilowatts.
Sukhumi Dam.....	Completed 1948.....	20,000 kilowatts.
Stalingrad.....	Began 1950; incomplete.....	1,700,000 kilowatts.
Sheherbakov Dam.....	5 units completed 1949.....	220,000 kilowatts.
Ust'-Kamenogorsk Dam.....	3 units completed 1952.....	240,000 kilowatts.
Narva.....	Pledged to be finished 1955.....	120,000 kilowatts.
Mingechar Dam.....	4 units operating July 1954.....	200,000 kilowatts.
Kuz' Minskaya Dam.....	In operation 1948.....	1,000 kilowatts.
Kuybyshev.....	Work well advanced 1952; first hydrogenerator completed 1954; all scheduled completion 1955.....	2,000,000 kilowatts (estimate).
Knyazhaya.....	Began 1952; first unit in operation 1955.....	Undisclosed.
Khrani Dam.....	Began 1935; first unit in operation 1947.....	90,000 kilowatts.
Kama Dam.....	First unit in operation 1954; 5 added since; not yet completed.....	504,000 kilowatts.
Kakhovka.....	2 units in operation, 1955.....	250,000 kilowatts.
Gyumush Dam.....	Under construction.....	214,000 kilowatts proposed.
Farkhad Dam.....	1st unit operating, 1947.....	120,000 kilowatts.
Dnepr Dam.....	Reconstruction completed, 1949.....	648,000 kilowatts.

Soviet Union hydroelectric projects completed or under construction since World War II—Con.

Project name	Status	Installed generating capacity
Bukhtarma.....	Under construction.....	420,000 kilowatts proposed.
Angara.....	do.....	1,200,000 kilowatts.
Votkinsk.....	do.....	Claimed to be one of largest in country.
Shirokovaskaya Dam.....	1st unit in operation, 1946 or 1947.....	Undisclosed.
Novosibirsk.....	Under construction.....	Undisclosed—"large."
Niva III.....	In operation, 1950.....	150,000 kilowatts.
Gor'kiy.....	Under construction.....	Undisclosed but "large."
Known total.....		8,217,000.

In order to compare our progress in this field with that of the U. S. S. R., I have had the Federal Power Commission tabulate the hydroelectric projects constructed or expanded in the United States since 1945. The installed generating capacity totals 10,176,780 kilowatts. It should be remembered, however, that this figure includes hydroelectric capacity that was installed in Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams before the war and since expanded.

United States publicly owned hydroelectric plants, 1945-55

Project name (50,000 kilowatts and over)	Installed kilowatt capacity	State
Fontana.....	202,500	North Carolina.
Grand Coulee ¹	1,954,000	Washington.
Shasta.....	375,000	California.
Wheeler ¹	259,200	Alabama.
Keswick.....	75,000	California.
Allatoona.....	74,000	Georgia.
Davis.....	225,000	Arizona.
Hoover ¹	667,500	Do.
Hungry Horse.....	285,000	Montana.
Rock Island.....	135,000	Washington.
J. H. Kerr.....	204,000	Virginia.
Boone.....	75,000	Tennessee.
Dale Hollow.....	54,000	Do.
Detroit.....	100,000	Oregon.
Flat Iron.....	71,500	Colorado.
Lookout Point.....	120,000	Oregon.
Chief Joseph.....	256,000	Washington.
Denison.....	70,000	Texas.
Kentucky.....	160,000	Kentucky.
Fort Peck ¹	85,000	Montana.
Fort Loudon.....	128,000	Tennessee.
Wautauga.....	50,000	Do.
Wilson ¹	436,000	Alabama.
Center Hill.....	135,000	Tennessee.
Wolf Creek.....	270,000	Kentucky.
Pickwick.....	216,000	Tennessee.
Bull Shoals.....	160,000	Arkansas.
Ross.....	270,000	Washington.
Clark Hill.....	280,000	South Carolina.
Cherokee.....	120,000	Tennessee.
McNary.....	700,000	Washington.
Fort Randall.....	280,000	South Dakota.
Douglas.....	112,000	Tennessee.
Folsom.....	162,000	California.
Blakely Mountain.....	75,000	Arkansas.
Grand total.....	8,841,700	

¹ Includes total installed capacity, part of which was installed before World War II.

United States privately owned hydroelectric plants, 1945-55

Project name (50,000 kilowatts and over)	State	Installed kilowatt capacity
Kerr.....	Montana.....	168,000
Bliss.....	Idaho.....	75,000
Cresta.....	California.....	67,500
Rock Creek.....	do.....	113,400
Big Creek No. 4.....	do.....	84,000
C. J. Strike.....	Idaho.....	82,800
Cabinet Gorge.....	do.....	200,000
Osage.....	Missouri.....	172,000
Yale.....	Washington.....	108,000
Harris.....	Maine.....	75,000
Roanoke Rapids.....	North Carolina.....	100,080
Pit No. 4.....	California.....	90,000
Total.....		1,335,780

RECAPITULATION

Total publicly owned hydroelectric plants.....	8,841,700
Total privately owned hydroelectric plants.....	1,335,780
Total.....	10,177,480

These two surveys give clear indication that this is no time for us to rest on our oars. We must go forward in developing and conserving our resources if we are to remain strong and if we are to afford our increasing population the benefits of an expanding economy. The upper Colorado River storage project—in the last remaining undeveloped major river basin in the Nation—is crying for development. Its vast resources should not be overlooked in favor of the status quo.

I am herewith submitting a series of descriptive articles on the various new projects in Soviet Russia since the end of World War II. A glance at the tremendous amount of construction involved gives a good picture of the program of development now going forward behind the Iron Curtain. The articles were furnished by the Library of Congress.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. As a Member of the House from the State of Utah, can the gentleman tell the House how many souls live in that part of Utah that can be reached by irrigation and power from these projects at the present time?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I would say we have perhaps 3 million souls in the upper basin area, and we are choking to death for water. Water is our lifeblood, without it we cannot exist. I further advise the gentleman that if we do not develop our power resources and the falling water in this country, the day is going to come when we shall regret it. You talk about atomic power. That day is coming when we shall have atomic power, but that does not give us the excuse for wasting our hydroelectric potential. This is a resource that does not wear out. It can produce energy and still be used for other purposes, whereas someday our uranium resources may be exhausted. You should also remember that 90 percent of the uranium produced in this country comes from this very area. We would not have atomic power in this country if we did not have those uranium-producing areas, and we are not going to continue our development unless we are able to get the water to bring these resources into production.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Yes; I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I take the floor to discuss a rather sensitive matter in connection with the upper Colorado River storage project. The words I am about to speak, I hope will not be taken as a reflection upon any of my colleagues. I do want to deal with what seems to me to be false propaganda, masquerading as information on the bill we are presently considering.

There came to my desk this morning a so-called tax map, which as you will see in the red headlines states, "New \$4 Billion Tax Burden Threatens You." It further states:

The tax map below shows you how much the upper Colorado River Basin project, now before Congress, would cost the taxpayers of each State in the Nation.

In smaller print you find these words:

Costs to States are based on the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation, New York City and Washington, D. C.

My own State, Nebraska, has a green circle around \$34 million, as a tax to the State because of this project. The fountainhead of this propaganda and big lie technique comes from the Colorado River Association with an address of 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. It has fooled a lot of people. It fooled newspapers all over the country.

The Jerome North Side News, of Jerome, Idaho, on August 11, 1955, carried the following editorial, showing they were misled by the information:

DUPED BY CALIFORNIA WATER-LOBBY MISREPRESENTATIONS

During May the News published a sketch illustrating the cost to Idaho of \$13,600,000 in new taxes for the upper Colorado River Basin project. The sketch listed the tax which each State would be compelled to pay into the Federal Treasury to finance its share of this huge project. An explanation under the sketch explained that the total cost of the project was \$4 billion, and this amount would be charged to each State on a per capita basis. New York was highest, with nearly a half billion in added taxes.

We find now that the publication of this sketch, with the supplemented information, was erroneous. We were duped. A so-called tax foundation with addresses in New York City and Washington, D. C., provided the information, according to the picture explanation. We were duped and have found out that the sketch with the erroneous information and statistics was compiled by the water lobby for the State of California. The upper Colorado bill authorizing the project in its entirety calls for an appropriation from Congress of only \$760 million, which is a far cry from \$4 billion.

Also, as in the case in most combination irrigation and power projects, the lands to be irrigated under the provisions of the bill will pay off the cost of the construction eventually, just as was the case in Idaho on several Federal and private projects, such as American Falls Dam, Owyhee Dam, etc.

The upper Colorado project is not an exclusive power undertaking such as Hells Canyon. It provides for expansion of irrigation in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyo-

ming, along with the many ramifications of the proposed project. It provides for a payment of 2½ percent interest on all moneys appropriated by Congress for its construction.

Such a program would not cost Idaho \$13,600,000 in added taxes. But California is confusing the issues intentionally so that the upper river States will be deprived of their waters and these waters in turn will revert to California. A few years ago California had a plan to appropriate waters from the Snake in Idaho, as farfetched as that may seem, but it was a plan. Idaho should certainly stand by the other Mountain States to preserve these water rights for the beneficial development of the States in which they originate. We have never heard of California sharing with other States such rights as oil rights, fishing rights, or any other natural resources which that great State possesses in its natural boundaries. And it is not logical or consistent that the neighboring States of the West should give up such cherished rights in water which they might hold or should serve to develop for their own use.

Let us take the so-called tax map which was a direct application of the big lie technique of propaganda. A number of newspapers throughout the country used the tax map because it appeared on its face to come from a reputable tax research organization. It even fooled the minority members of our committee because they say in their minority report, and I quote:

The percent of the Federal tax burden by States as computed by the tax foundation shows that less than 2 percent of this required Federal subsidy would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the chief beneficiaries of the project.

This tax map was deliberately prepared by the southern California lobby to cloak their propaganda with the respectability of the nationally known tax research group.

On July 11, 1955, after these tax maps had been printed by a number of good newspapers throughout the country, the editorial director of the Tax Foundation found it necessary to mail out letters denying any connection with that propaganda effort. Here is the letter:

JULY 11, 1955.

MR. H. ALLEN PAINTER,
Editor, Hackettstown Gazette,
Hackettstown, N. J.

DEAR MR. PAINTER: Our attention has been called to an editorial appearing in your newspaper on May 12 entitled, "One Hundred Forty-four Million Dollars for New Jersey To Pay." This editorial was reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 1955. The editorial says the Tax Foundation mailed to your paper a map showing what it would cost the various States if the upper Colorado River Basin project is approved.

I am writing this letter simply to set the record straight in regard to the map sent you. The map was not sent by the Tax Foundation, which is a private, nonprofit research organization. We have seen copies of this map in other newspapers. It was prepared by the Colorado River Association, with which the Tax Foundation has no connection. Apparently, the Colorado Association adapted a formula the Tax Foundation devised to apportion the tax burden among the various States, applied this to the cost of the upper Colorado River Basin project, and credited the Tax Foundation with the resulting figures. The Foundation did not prepare these figures, which were published without our knowledge or consent.

For your information, I am enclosing the May 1954 issue of 1 of our monthly publications, Tax Outlook, which carries on page 12 an article (A Better Yardstick) describing the formula we developed for allocating the tax burden.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT D. MARTIRE,
Editorial Director.

The Colorado River Association referred to in the foundation's letter is a registered lobby which has reported receipts in 1955 of \$195,700.00.

Mr. Chairman, the other body has a committee investigating lobby activities. A careful, microscopic examination might find some overripe fruit in the activities of the Colorado River Association. This same organization has turned its unrestrained propagandists loose in other areas of public misrepresentation. Not being satisfied with a false map of taxes, they now have other maps relative to rich farmlands in other States that should be placed under cultivation in lieu of a long-range project to develop badly needed water for a four-State semidesert area larger than New England.

This lobby tries to use the prestige of the Soil Conservation Service just as they tried to represent that the source of the tax map was the Tax Foundation. A southern California lobbyist distorts the facts relative to the cost of the self-liquidating Colorado River project, saying it will mean \$4 billion in added taxes. They misrepresent the facts, saying the project will bring in 580 million new acres of arid mountain land. The truth is the units proposed for authorization will add about 132,000 acres of new land over an estimated 30-year construction period.

This southern California lobby has also attempted to discredit the engineering studies at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. The same engineers who had a big hand in building the Hoover, Grand Coulee, the David and the Parkers Dams had a big part in planning, after many years of technical research, the upper Colorado River Basin storage project.

The geology of the Glen Canyon site was thoroughly explored in congressional hearings. The selection of that site was approved by both the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. Mr. Dexheimer, of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified as follows:

I personally have been in on the original exploration and construction of the Hoover and the Shasta Dams and many others in days before they were conceived. I have investigated this site and gone through the geology. We have done a great deal more investigating on Glen Canyon than we have on Hoover or the others. We have no doubt at all but what a dam 700 feet high at the Glen Canyon site is entirely practical, feasible, and economical and would be safe from the engineering standpoint.

Later in the hearings he was asked if these conclusions were tentative. Mr. Dexheimer replied:

No, sir. They are firm conclusion for a structure up to 700 feet. There is no question in our minds.

It is clear that good, competent engineers have made positive evaluations approving the Glen Canyon site. Only

the southern California lobby will contribute to the coming unwarranted and irresponsible attacks on the Glen Canyon Dam engineers. I am sure my colleagues will not be taken in or misled by some of their propaganda.

The only major opposition comes from the southern California water lobby which stands to profit by millions of dollars if they can succeed in delaying or defeating development, but the four upper-basin States have water allocated to them in a solemn, interstate compact signed in 1928. If they can defeat this project, they will have the unused water going downstream where their hydro-power turbines utilize the water. The rest of the unused water will either be used in California or New Mexico or flow into the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman spoke a few moments ago about the development of uranium resources in the area. As I understand it, it is alleged that the flooding of this area to capture the water resources would destroy the possibility of developing the uranium resources.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am glad the gentleman raised that question, and I would like to answer it. I do not know whether the Members heard it, but the gentleman says it has been alleged by the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, if we flood some of this area, it could flood some valuable uranium resources. I think the best information we can get on that subject would be from the Atomic Energy Commission. That is the best source of information I know of. I have before me a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, dated February 14, 1956, directed to Senator ANDERSON, in which this statement, among others, is made:

Based upon present knowledge, no appreciable amount of commercial grade uranium or other radioactive ore would be inundated by the reservoir to be formed by the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

JESSE C. JOHNSON,
Director of the Division of Raw Materials, Atomic Energy Commission.

I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman claimed that there was a great potential development of uranium in the area. Where will this uranium be found, if the statement the gentleman just read is true?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. May I point out to the gentleman that the only area covered by this reservoir is in the bed of the stream. We have thousands and thousands of acres out there, all around the area, which is uranium country, and so this is a very small spot, and according to the Atomic Energy Commission they know of no considerable amount of uranium in the bed of that stream. Of course, it takes water to conduct these milling operations out there, and it takes water for the people to live there to develop them. I wish I had the time to develop this further, but in the interest of time I am going to insert in the Record, under permission previously granted

to me, the details I have referred to. I hope the Members will take the time tomorrow to read it in the RECORD and examine it in some detail.

PROJECT: TSIMLYANSKAYA DAM

Location: The Tsimlyanskaya hydro power development, an essential part of the Volga-Don waterway system, is located near the new Tsimlyanskaya Stanitsa in Rostovskaya Oblast'. The powerplant is on the left bank of the Don River.

Brief history: The development was built between 1949 and 1952. The power station generated its first industrial current in June 1952. Navigation from the Sea of Azov to the reservoir began in April 1953. The Donskoy main irrigation canal was filled with water from the reservoir in April 1953.

Brief description: The dam has the functions of navigation, irrigation, and water supply as well as of power production. The major feature is a concrete gravity spillway dam 495.5 meters long and 60 meters wide at crest, with spillway crest 19 meters above the tail race level. Earth dams totaling 12.8 kilometers in length and with a base 300 meters wide include 9.9 kilometers of hydraulic fill with a maximum height of 35 meters, and 2.9 kilometers of rolled-fill with a maximum height of 11.8 meters. The run-of-the-river hydroelectric power station is equipped with four vertical 6-blade, 150-ton Kaplan turbines, coupled directly with four 40,000 kilowatts vertical umbrella type generators. There are two navigation locks, a river harbor, a railroad and highway across the dam, a fish-lock elevator and uncompleted installations to supply irrigation water to 750,000 hectares and water supply to an area of 2 million hectares. The water distributing system will include the 190 kilometers long Donskoy main irrigation canal extending from the reservoir, other distributing canals totaling 568 kilometers in length and about 140 pumping stations.

Capacity: The reservoir, with a maximum width of 38 kilometers and an average depth 8.4 meters raises the elevation of the river as far as 350 to 360 kilometers. The area at normal elevation is 2,700 square kilometers and total capacity is 24,000,000,000 cubic meters with an effective capacity of 12,600,000,000 cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-ampere): Installed: 160,000 kilowatts (1953).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year): Proposed: 500 million kilowatt-hours to 650 million kilowatt-hours (1952).

Some facts relating to cost: Earth work amounted to some 76,400,000 cubic meters, of which 29,500,000 cubic meters were obtained by the hydraulic-fill method. Concrete and reinforced concrete amounted to 1,900,000 cubic meters, of which 1,213,700 cubic meters were used on the spillway, powerhouse, fish-lock elevator, etc.

Selected references: Razin, N. V., Peryshkin, G. A., Smirnov, K. I. Tsimlyanskiy Gidrouzel, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 12, December 1952, pages 6-11; V Sovete Ministrov S. S. S. R. Ostroitel'stve Volgo-Donskogo Sudokhodnogo Kanala I Orosheniya Zemel' V Rostovskoy I Stalingradskoy Oblastyakh, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 1, January 1951, pages 1-3.

PROJECT: SVIR' UPPER DAM

Location: On the Svir' River, near Podporozh'ye village, some 96 kilometers downstream from Lake Onega. The dam with its lock, will be a part of the Marinsky inland waterway system which connects the Baltic Sea, the Volga River Basin and the Northern White Sea waterway system.

Brief history: Construction began in 1936; opening was proposed for 1938, then postponed to 1942. There were interruptions and flooding during the war years. Work was

underway again by 1946 but the dam was still under construction in 1952.

Brief description: The concrete dam is thought to be about 26 meters high and of the gravity type. Little information is available on the earth dam other than that it is of the embankment type.

A one chamber lock of reinforced concrete is indicated for the left bank of the river, with a capacity estimated at about 28 ships per 24 hours. The powerhouse is planned for location between the spillway section and the lock. Proposed installations would include 4 Kaplan-type vertical turbines of 37,500 horsepower rating and 4 generators of 25,000 kilovolt-ampere rating. There will be interconnection with the Lower Svir' plant for transmitting energy to Leningrad.

Capacity: There will be no reservoir, the plant will be of the run-of-the-river type with pondage formed by the dam.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Projected 144,000 kilowatts (1937); projected 160,000 kilowatts (1939).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 700 million kilowatt-hours estimated (1937).

Some facts relating to cost: By 1939 the following work had been completed: 653,000 cubic meters of concrete used; 2,651,500 cubic meters of earth used for embankment; 4,317,000 cubic meters of earth excavated; 200,000 cubic meters of wood piling used; 1,204 meters of steel cut-off piling used.

By April 1948, 615,000 cubic meters of earthwork and 18,000 cubic meters of concrete work were reported as completed. There are indications that nearly 265,000 cubic meters of excavation work may have been carried out during 1949 and 1950.

Selected references: Svir'stroy (Leningrad), issues 3, 5, and 6, 1935, pages 3-87; Kudyrskiy, A. R. Osrovnnye Polozheniya Tekhnicheskogo Proyerta Elektromekhanicheskoy Chasti Gidrostantsii, Svir' II, Svir'stroy (Leningrad), No. 12, 1937, pages 158-181.

PROJECT: SUKHUMI DAM

Location: The main dam is located on the East Gumista River, between Andreyevskoye and Mikhaylovskoye villages, about 32 kilometers northeast of Sukhumi, in the Abkhazskaya A. S. S. R. An auxiliary dam on the Tsumur River, together with the above, supply water to the powerhouse, which is located on the West Gumista River.

Brief history: Work began in 1933 and was completed in 1948.

Brief description: The rivers being non-navigable, this project serves for power production purposes only. The main dam on the East Gumista is indicated as a concrete spillway dam with crest gate more than 28 meters above its foundation in height and has a 10-meter spillway. The auxiliary dam of concrete on the Tsumur is of spillway type with sluice gate 5 meters high and 14 meters wide at the crest. A 327-meter tunnel connects this part of the project with the East Gumista. The generated power is indicated as supplied to the town of Sukhumi and perhaps to a section of the Black Sea Railroad.

Capacity: No reservoir is formed by either dam.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Proposed, 20,000 kilowatts (1937).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year): Proposed 100 million kilowatt-hours (1937).

Some facts relating to cost (materials used):

The volume of work on the East Gumista River:

Earthwork, 1,120 cubic meters.
Rockwork, 26,418 cubic meters.
Concrete, 11,060 cubic meters.
Reinforced concrete, 3,427 cubic meters.
Rock fill, 5,840 cubic meters.
Granite facing, 490 cubic meters.
Volume of work on the Tsumur headworks:
Earthwork, 1,334 cubic meters.
Rockwork, 7,000 cubic meters.

Concrete, 4,500 cubic meters.
Reinforced concrete, 53 cubic meters.
Granite facing, 406 cubic meters.
Work on pressure tunnel:
Rockwork, 16,925 cubic meters.
Concrete, 13,263 cubic meters.
Reinforcement, 349 tons.
Work on powerhouse:
Earthwork, 17,100 cubic meters.
Rockwork, 51,789 cubic meters.
Concrete, 11,284 cubic meters.
Reinforced concrete, 4,529 cubic meters.
Stone laying, 3,897 cubic meters.

Selected references: Rutkovskiy, S. G. Gidrotekhnicheskaya Ustanovka NA R. Gumiste-Sukhumges, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 7, 1937, page 34.

PROJECT: STALINGRAD

Location: On the Volga at its confluence with the Aktuba, on the northern outskirts of Stalingrad, Stalingradskaya, Oblast RSFSR.

Brief history: Organizational and preparatory work began in 1950; actual construction work on the foundation pit for the dam and powerhouse was to begin in the second half of 1951. The first concrete was poured for the powerhouse on September 5, 1954. The spillway dam construction pit was drained, commencing on June 27, 1955, preparatory to further excavation and eventual construction. The project was initially scheduled for completion in 1955, or before. But it appears to have been considerably delayed, with one statement being to the effect that five times as much rock and gravel would be required in 1956 as in 1955.

Brief description: It is claimed by the Soviets that it will be the largest construction project on the Volga. The dam, largely of earthen construction, will be over 5 kilometers in total length and high enough to raise the water level 26 meters. The dam itself will be up to 45 meters high. It will be of the nonoverflow type, with the earth portions connecting the spillway, pier, and lock portions to the banks. The right bank earth dam will be 1,300 to 1,400 meters long, whereas the left bank earth dam will be 2,300 meters in length. The foundation pit for power plant in some places exceeds 30 meters in depth and is 75 hectares in area.

Directly related is the construction of the gravity-flow Volga-Ural Canal, about 650 kilometers long, which has been indicated for completion in 1956. Work (excavation) was indicated as about to start in 1952. Also a bypass canal, 6 kilometers long, was being dug in 1954 for ships to pass around the dam and powerhouse, apparently a temporary diversion until the project, including locks, should be completed.

The 400 kilovolt transmission line from Stalingrad-Moscow will be about 1,100 kilometers long. It is indicated that the energy produced will be distributed approximately as follows: 4 billion kilowatt-hours to Moscow; 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours to central areas; 2,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours to Saratov, Stalingrad and Astrakhan areas; 2 billion kilowatt-hours for irrigation and water supply in the trans-Volga and Caspian lowland areas.

Some 1,500,000,000 hectares of land will be irrigated due to the electric energy produced by the Stalingrad Power Plant and 11,500,000,000 hectares will thereby be enabled to have a sufficient water supply.

Included will be turbines and generators of the same type as at Kuybyshev but perhaps only 17 instead of 20 of them.

Capacity: It is estimated that the reservoir, about 650 kilometers long and 30 kilometers wide, will cover 4,500 square kilometers, much of it good farm land.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-ampere): from a low of 1,300,000 kilowatts to 1,700,000 kilowatts (usual) to 2,310,000 kilowatt (recent high estimate).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour-year): about 10 billion kilowatt-hours (estimated for average year).

Some facts relating to cost: 75 million cubic meters of earth work are reported as having been completed, including 62 million by hydraulic fill. The total amount of earth to be moved is indicated as 150 million cubic meters, or, including the canal, in excess of 500 million cubic meters. At least 7 million cubic meters of concrete will be poured. About 400,000 cubic meters of concrete have been poured, with the amount to increase to 1,500,000 cubic meters in 1956 and 3 million cubic meters per year eventually, for a period not indicated.

Selected references: The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, volume vii, No. 35, October 12, 1955, pages 17-18, which carries a long item from Pravda; Loginov, F. At the Construction Site of the Stalingrad Hydroelectric Power Plant, Pravda, October 25, 1954, page 2; Davydov, Eng. M. The Giant Power Development in Stalingrad, Kul'turno-Prosvetitel'naya rabota, 1952.

PROJECT: SHCHERBAKOV DAM

Location: This most northeasterly project of the upper Volga power development (which includes Uglich and Ivan'kovo as well) is near the confluence of the Volga and Shchekna, a left tributary. Shcherbakov is the nearest large town.

Brief history: Work began in the winter of 1935-36. The first unit was installed in November 1941, development being continued during the war in order to supply electric power to Moscow. A second unit was installed in January 1942, a third in September 1945 and a fifth in 1949.

Brief description: The installations on the Volga consist of a concrete gravity spillway dam a little more than 30 meters in height above the river bed and foundations, and about 100 meters in length at crown, with 8 sluices, each 8.5 meters wide and 5 meters high. There are embankments on both banks, a twin lock at the left and a right-bank earth dam.

The development on the Shchekna River includes embankments on both banks, a powerhouse on the right bank and a nonoverflow earth dam which rises to a height of 33.4 meters above river bed and foundations, and is 0.5 kilometers wide at the base and 700 meters in length at crown. The right-bank embankment is 3.4 kilometers long, 16 meters high, has a 2,200,000 cubic meter volume and was built by the hydraulic-fill method. The smaller left-bank embankment, built by the same method, is only 230,000 cubic meters in volume, is 500 meters long and has a maximum height of 15 meters.

The lock on the Volga makes possible navigation control from Gor'kiy to Uglich. Five Kaplan 55,000-kilowatt turbines are included in the power installations, which belongs to the Moscow power system and supplies power to the capital.

Capacity: The reservoir has an area of 4,700 square kilometers, the largest man-made reservoir in the U. S. S. R. It is over 100 kilometers long and 50 to 60 kilometers wide; depth is as much as 26 meters in places. Maximum capacity is given as 11 billion cubic meters and effective capacity as 7.6 billion cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes) proposed: 220,000 kilowatts (1936), 330,000 kilowatts (1938); installed: 220,000 kilowatts (1949).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours per year) proposed: 1 billion kilowatt-hours (1936), 1 billion kilowatt hours (1939); achieved: 92 million kilowatt-hours (1946).

Some facts relating to cost: The amount of work needed was indicated:

Earth work, 30 million cubic meters.
Concrete, 1,400,000 cubic meters.
Equipment, 7,800 tons.
Metal structures, 21,000 tons.

Brick laying, 7 million pieces.

Rock work, 270,000 square meters.

Hydraulic-fill, 10,800,000 cubic meters.

Selected references: Arngol'd. Verkhnev-olzhskiy Gidroustanovki. Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 1, 1936, page 43; Vyazemskiy O. V. and Veselov, V. V., Gidrostantsiya S Nizkim Mashinnym Zalom I Vneshnim Raspolozheniyem Mashinnyykh Kranov; Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 1/2, 1944, page 16.

PROJECT: UST'-KAMENOGORSK DAM

Location: On the Irtysh River, a left tributary of the Ob' River, at the village of Ablakotka, above the confluence of the Ablakotka and Irtysh Rivers, about 12 km. from the town of Ust'-Kamenogorsk in Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya oblast', Kazakh SSR.

Brief history: Preparatory work commenced in 1938 and actual work started in 1944. The first concrete was poured in 1948. The second unit was installed in August 1952. The third unit was installed in December 1952.

Brief description: This is the first completed project of 3 planned since 1938 on the Irtysh River. It will be the second upstream dam when the entire system is built. There are more than the usual uncertainties as to details, two full plans having been prepared, with, as yet no definite information as to which was carried out. The dam is indicated as 45 meters thick at the base, 67.2 meters in maximum height, and perhaps as much as 421.7 meters in length at the crown. The maximum head would be about 40-41 meters. The spillway would be 122 meters, the nonoverflow section at the left bank 120 meters and the nonoverflow section between lock and right bank 70 meters. A 1-chamber lock 180 meters long serves navigation. A 6 unit powerhouse was planned for Francis, 40,000 kilowatts, 125 revolutions per minute turbines and generators of the umbrella type. The plant is interconnected with the Altay Power System.

Capacity: The dam raises the water level in the river for 80 kilometers.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): 240,000 kilowatts (proposed in 1939).

Some facts related to cost: 600,000 cubic meters of concrete was used for the dam.

Selected references: Ust'-Kamenogorskaya Gidroeletrostantsiya, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow) No. 6, 1947, page 27; Korolev, A. A., Ust'-Kamenogorskaya Gidroeletricheskaya Stantsiya Na Reke Irtyshe, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), No. 6, page 1.

PROJECT: NARVA

Location: Slightly below the famous falls, near Narva, Leningrad Oblast', RSFSR.

Brief history: Final tests on the first turbine under pressure were being made in late September 1955 and there was a pledge to finish the plant in 1955.

Brief description: The dam, of the reinforced concrete spillway type, will not be high and will form only a small head. There will be earth dams on both the right and left of the spillway dam. The powerhouse is below and on the right side of the river, served by a diversion canal 2 kilometers long.

Capacity: The reservoir will have an area of 20,000 hectares, otherwise mentioned as 200 square kilometers. There is mention of two turbines and 120,000 kilowatt capacity.

Some facts relating to cost: About 2 million cubic meters of earth and 500,000 cubic meters of rock were excavated.

Selected reference: A. A. Belyakov, At the Narva Waterfalls. Nauka i Zhizn' No. 8, 1954, pp. 3-5.

PROJECT: MINGECHAUR DAM

Location: This dam on the Kura River is located near the town of Mingechaur (and

the railroad station of the same name) in the Khaldanskiy Rayon, Azerbaidzhan SSR.

Brief history: Earth works were first started in early 1945. In June 1947 work was started on the foundation pit. In 1951 work was started on the hydraulic fill dam. In 1953 the Mingechaur Sea appeared on the map. As of January 1954, basic work at Mingechaur was completed. At that time the water intake was built, as well as the first stage of the powerhouse for three generating units, the outdoor step-up substation and the step-down receiving substation, etc. On January 10, 1954, the two first generating units were put in operation. In July 1954, the fourth unit was put in operation.

Brief description: The basic purpose of this development is the regulation of the flow of the Kura River, not only for power production but for irrigation and improvement of navigation between the town of Yevlakh and the Caspian Sea. There is, however, no navigation lock.

The dam, an earth dam of hydraulic-fill type, built in the shape of a deep arch is 1,540 meters in total length, 520 meters thick at the base and has a maximum height above foundations of 87.5 meters. Various reinforced concrete structures, intakes, spillway and discharge sluices, are built into the earth dam. The powerhouse, located at the tall race slope of the dam, included installations of 4 vertical Francis turbines and 4 vertical 50,000 kilowatts generators as of July 1954, with installation of 2 more units anticipated. Four main irrigation canals are fed from the reservoir to irrigate about 1,500,000 hectares of Kura and Araks lowland.

Capacity: The reservoir is about 75 kilometers in length, 13 kilometers in width, has an area of 630 square kilometers and a capacity of about 17 cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilowatt-amperes): proposed, 300,000 kilowatts (1946 and later); installed, 200,000 kilowatts (as of July 1954).

It was anticipated that all six generating units would be in operation at full capacity at the end of 1954, giving an installed capacity of 300,000 kilowatts.

Electric output (kilowatt hours/year): No information available except what may be derived by computation from above.

Some facts relating to cost: The total volume of the earth dam is about 30 million cubic meters. It was necessary to excavate about 9 million cubic meters of earth for the foundation of the dam and other structures. The total volume of reinforced concrete structures in the development is about 1 million cubic meters.

Selected references: Veytkov, F. L. Utverzhdeniye Tekhnicheskogo Proyektta Mingechaurskogo Gidrouzla, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1947, No. 8, page 28; Domanskiy, V. E. Opyt Vozvedeniya Krupnoy Namynoy Plotiny, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1954, No. 1, pages 10-13.

PROJECT: KUZ'MINSKAYA DAM

Location: It is located on the Oka River, a right tributary of the Volga, near Kuz'minskaya Village, upstream from the town of Ryazan', Ryabanskaya Oblast.

Brief history: The dam was completed by the end of 1946 and put in operation in 1948.

Brief description: No details are available but this apparently is a low dam on a rather small river. The river varies from 140 to 430 meters in width and the depth near Ryazan' varies from 2 to 5 meters with an extreme of 10 meters. The lock in the dam contributes to control of navigation on the river. The power is apparently largely utilized by nearby collective farms.

Capacity: The river serves as a reservoir.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Installed capacity 1,000 kilowatts.

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 123,000 kilowatt-hours (1953).

Some facts relating to costs: 10,000 cubic meters of earth excavated; 4,500 cubic meters of concrete work done; 5,000 cubic meters of lumber used; 625 tons of iron used and 1,500 tons of cement used.

Selected references: Azmechatei'nyye Pemyeny, Nauka i Zhizn' (Moscow), No. 1, 1953, pp. 30-32; Basseyn Verkhney Volgi U Oki, Spravochnik Po Vodnym Resursam SSSR (Moscow), 1936, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 130-131.

PROJECT: KUYBYSHEV

Location: Near Zhigulevsk on the Samara bend of the lower Volga, Kuybyshevskaya Oblast', RSFSR.

Brief history: Work was reported as well advanced in 1952 and scheduled for completion in 1955 or shortly thereafter. The first hydrogenerator was reported as completed early in 1954. The lower navigation lock, said to have been built in less than 4 years, was reported as opened on July 31, 1955. Eight turbines were reported as having been delivered in March 1955.

Brief description: The dam is largely of earth construction, about 3.9 kilometers in length, 36 meters wide, and rises to a height of 36 meters. Initial construction efforts involved a huge coffer dam 4.5 kilometers long and 18 meters high at some points. A third coffer dam, to go around the ferroconcrete spillway dam excavation, was 8 kilometers long. Four large concrete constructions are included—the spillway dam, the powerhouse, and upper and lower locks. The spillway dam is 1,200 meters long. Shiplocks will consist of 2 sets of locks on 2 levels and a 3 kilometer sector between where winter anchorage and shipyard will be. Railway lines were built to the project at both banks of the river, some 162 kilometers in total. An overhead cableway to transport materials to concrete plants was erected.

It was reported that 10 plants with a total output of 4,500,000 cubic meters of concrete per year were built for the construction of the development. About 500 million kilowatt-hours per year will be devoted to irrigation pumping for 1 million hectares of land in the trans-Volga area.

There will be 17 to 20 adjustable blade hydroturbines rated at 126,000 kilowatts each for normal head and sometimes estimated as low as 105,000 kilowatts for minimum head, each to weigh 1,600 tons. It is claimed by the Soviets that the generators are the largest ever assembled. They will be 40 meters tall, equivalent to an 8 or 9 story building in height. Each hour a mass of water equal to 1,800,000 cubic meters, a lake 1 kilometer square and 2 meters deep, will flow through the turbine. The foundation pit of the spillway section will be 1,200 meters long, 450 meters wide, and 20 meters deep—that for the powerplant will be 300 meters long and 45 to 50 meters deep. Many wells and pumping are required to control seepage.

The transmission will involve new design to transmit alternating 3-phase at 400 kilovolts. More than 900 kilometers of transmission line will be involved and 50,000 tons of steel will be used in the erection, along with 700,000 cubic meters of earthwork and 200,000 cubic meters of concrete work. The conductor will be aluminum over a steel core; some 20,000 kilometers of cable and 600,000 insulators will be involved. Towers, about half a kilometer apart, will weigh 7 to 18 tons and be as tall as a 7 story building. Split conductors will be used—3 conductors for each phase of alternating current, or 9 conductors for the 3-phase transmission. Uncommon use will be made of condensers. It is anticipated that about 6 billion kilowatt-hours per year will be transmitted to Moscow, but to utilize this power it will be necessary to reorganize the power system of Moscow, especially to reconstruct its underground cable network.

Capacity: The Kuybyshev Sea will stretch 580 kilometers along the Volga, 300 kilometers along the Kama, will have a maximum width of 40 kilometers, cover an area of more than 5,500 square kilometers, and have a capacity of 19,500,000,000 cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): 1,700,000 kilowatts (lower estimate), 2 million kilowatts (usual estimate), and 2,100,000 kilowatts (higher estimate).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 11 billion kilowatt-hours (estimated annual average).

Some facts relating to cost: It perhaps should be noted that this development, much more than most, was to a comparatively high degree mechanized and employed a considerable amount of what we may call for want of a better term, automation. A very early estimate (1936) was that 206,000,000 cubic meters of earth and rock would be excavated and over 3 million cubic meters of concrete would be poured. Some 12 billion cubic meters were removed from the foundation pit for the powerhouse. The two lower lock chambers were reported as requiring 630,000 cubic meters of concrete, more than 5 million cubic meters of earth were moved and placed, 35,000 tons of structures installed. More than 30,000 tons of piling were driven. For the main structures it is estimated that 160 million cubic meters of earthwork are required, 8 million cubic meters of concrete and reinforced concrete and almost 100,000 tons of metal constructions assembled.

Selected references: Electrification of the U. S. S. R., U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin, December 31, 1951, p. 763, Venikov, V. A., 400 kilovolt Transmission Line Nauka i Zhizn', No. 4, April 1953, pages 6-12; Razin, N. V. Mekhanizatsiya Zemlyanykh Rabot Na Kuybyshevskidrostroye (Mechanization of Earthwork at Kuybyshev Hydro Power Construction Project) Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo, No. 1, 1954, pages 5-10; Kronzin I., Kuybyshev GES Must be Put Into Operation in 1955, Pravda, November 26, 1954, page 2; Decisive Phase at the Great Construction, Pravda, March 7, 1955, page 2.

PROJECT: KNYAZHAYA GUBA

Location: Beyond the Arctic Circle, on the Kovda River, where it empties into Kandalaksha Bay of the White Sea, Murmansk Province.

Brief history: After exploratory work, actual work on the station began in early 1952. The first unit of the station was put in operation in October 1955.

Brief description: The river and lake (Kovdozero) exits were blocked, and water sent from the elevated lake across a narrow isthmus to the sea, utilizing the total drop of about 53 meters. The blocking dam of earth is 900 meters long. Longer dikes were built at low points in the ridge. The station is said to be completely automatic.

Capacity: Reservoir has a usable volume of almost 2 billion cubic meters.

Some facts relating to cost: In this previously unsettled area it was necessary to build a settlement as well as the project, 6,200,000 cubic meters of earth and rock were moved, 115,000 cubic meters of concrete poured and 1,300 tons of steel used, as well as roads, powerlines and telephone lines built.

Selected references: Especially Izvestia and Pravda for October 21, 1955, as reported by the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, vol. vii, No. 42, November 30, 1955, p. 15 et seq.

PROJECT: KHRAMI DAM

Location: On the Khrami River near its confluence with the Agri-Chay River, near the village of Barmaksiz in Tsalkinsky Rayon, Georgian S. S. R.

Brief history: Construction started in 1935; one tunnel was completed in 1939. Construction was interrupted by the war

but there is no information on damage. Work progressed and the reservoir was filled in 1946. The first generating unit was put into operation late in December 1947.

Brief description: The full development includes dam works, diversion and power station. The headworks consists of the dam, the overflow saddle spillway, and a 221 meters long bypass tunnel discharge conduit. The dam is of the rock-fill type with a stainless steel facing on the headrace side, a channel discharge spillway on the left side and a bypass discharge tunnel on the right side. The maximum height of the dam above foundations is 30 meters. The length at crown is 113.5 meters.

Capacity: The capacity of the reservoir is variously estimated as 230 million cubic meters to about 350 million cubic meters.

The power station is operated as an interconnected peakload plant to cover deficiencies in power supply during dry months when other Georgian power stations have a decline in production. Installations include 3 30,000-kilowatt generators.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): proposed 90,000 kilowatts (1937, 1939); installed, 90,000 kilowatts (1951).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year): proposed 27 million kilowatt-hours (1937).

Some facts relating to cost:

Total volume of earth and rock work on dam, 1 million cubic meters.

Total concrete work, 200,000 cubic meters. Metal structures and reinforcements, 25,000 tons.

Selected references: Eristov, V. S. Plotina Iz Kamennoy Nabroski, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1945, No. 4/5, pp. 3-7; No. 6, pp. 1-7; Sooruzheniye Napornogo Tunnelya Vysokonapornoy Reguliruyushchey Ges Boi'shoy Moshchnosti, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo (Moscow), 1948, No. 11, pp. 15-19 and No. 12, pp. 17-23.

PROJECT: KAMA DAM

Location: On the Kama River, a left tributary of the Volga, in the West Ural Mountain section of the U. S. S. R., 3 kilometers downstream from the Chusovaya-Kama confluences and immediately north of the town of Molotov. It is the first large hydropower development in the Ural Mountains region.

Brief history: Preliminary surveys were made in 1935. Construction was interrupted by World War II but resumed in 1947. The first generating unit was put in operation in September 1954 and at least five more units were installed and interconnected with the system soon thereafter. Development, however, is not yet completed.

Brief description: The development includes a nonoverflow earth dam 1,250 meters in length of which 655 meters is in the river bed, and the remainder across the marshland of the left bank. There is a concrete spillway dam 386 meters in length with combined built-in generating units. This is noteworthy as the first structure of its kind in the U. S. S. R.—the generating units being installed under the spillway openings, inside the dam, between the piers. There are 24 spillway openings. Turbines are of a medium capacity (21,000 kilowatts). Six were installed in 1954 and the plan includes six more to be installed by the end of 1955, with 24 as the ultimate goal. The plant will provide power for the Molotov, Sverdlovsk, and Chelyabinsk regions. A six-chamber twin navigation lock is under construction, through which it is anticipated considerable amounts of ores and grains, and large amounts of timber will move.

Capacity: The dam is expected to create a reservoir covering 200,000 hectare with a volume of 10 cubic kilometers. It will raise the water level for a distance of 330 kilometers on the Kama River and 170 kilometers on the Chusovaya River. The reservoir will be 25 to 30 kilometers wide in

places and the water level will be raised 21 meters.

Electric capacity (kilowatt-amperes): 350,000 kilowatts (proposed in 1935); 125,000 kilowatts (installed in 1954); 504,000 kilowatts (ultimate proposed).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): No information other than what may be derived by computation from the above.

Some facts relating to cost: The following amounts of materials were indicated as used:

Excavation work, 6,900,000 cubic meters.
Rock work, 520,000 cubic meters.
Hydraulic fill, 14,200,000 cubic meters.
Concrete and reinforced concrete, 970,000 cubic meters.

Steel structures and bridges, 25,800 tons.
Steel piling, 22,500 tons.

Selected references: Vasil'yev, A. F., *Perkrytiye Reki Pri Stroitel'stve Krupnoy Ges Hidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1954, No. 2, page 1; Zagorodnikov, B. I., *Kamskaya Gidroelektricheskaya Stantsiya Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1948, No. 12, page 30; Uspenskiy, B. S., *O Vyboire Tipa Gidroelektrostantsiy Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1948, No. 3, page 19.

PROJECT: KAKHOVKA

Location: Just below Kakhovka and near Kazatskoye Village on the lower Dnepr, Kherzonskaya Oblast', Ukraine.

Brief history: Construction began about 1950. Navigation locks were used beginning in June 1955. The first turbine unit was put in production in October 1955 and the second on November 23, 1955.

Brief description: A hydraulic-fill dam cuts across the river to a reinforced concrete dam about 450 meters long with 28 spillways. Then comes the powerhouse, with 6 turbines weighing about 2,000 tons each, next to which is the lock, at the entrance of which stands the intake structure. The hydraulic-fill dam continues to the outskirts of Novaya Kakhovka; beyond which starts the Krasnoznamen'skiy irrigation canal, to serve 2,400,000 acres of semiarid steppe. The earth dam will total 2.5 to 3.0 kilometers. Additionally, it is necessary to protect 2 important places with dikes; Marganets will be protected by dikes 7.5 kilometers long, 11 meters high, and containing 4,600,000 cubic meters of hydraulic fill. Nikopol' will be protected by a dike 19 meters high which already contains 150,000 tons of granite and 1,300,000 cubic meters of fill. Even so, it was reported necessary to move from the inundated area over 250 kilometers of railroad and automobile highways and thousands of homes.

Apparently peak power will be available in spring and summer, at which time this development will be the main source of power to Donbass and Rostov.

Capacity: The level of the Kakhovka Sea will rise 8 meters, it will extend for 200 kilometers, and will be 20 to 25 kilometers wide, will cover 2,000 square kilometers; the capacity will be as much as 19 billion cubic meters.

Electric capacity (kilowatt-amperes): 250,000 kilowatts (as initially planned).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): 1,400 million kilowatt-hours (estimated annual average). Another estimate puts the average as low as 1,200 million kilowatt-hours.

Some facts relating to cost: More than 27 million cubic meters of earth were moved, or to be moved. Some 1,250,000 cubic meters of concrete were poured; 120,000 tons of steel structure, reinforcements, and equipment were assembled, and 30,000 tons of piling were driven.

Selected references: Pravda, October 19, 1955, page 2, as carried by the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, volume vii, No. 42, November 30, 1955, page 14; the "Pet" Child of the Peoples of the Soviet Union, Slavyan,

No. 6, June 1954, pages 42-46; Andrianov, S., *Kakhovka Hydroelectric Power Plant Will Start Generating Power for the Country Ahead of Schedule*, Pravda, July 29, 1955, page 2.

PROJECT: GYUMUSH DAM

Location: The powerhouse is on the left bank of the Razdan River, about 6.6 kilometers from the village of Gyumush, Armenian, S. S. R. The dam itself is near the village of Agpara, about 35 kilometers from Lake Sevan. This project belongs to the Lake Sevan-Razdan River hydropower development, for which eight powerplants were proposed for construction on the Razdan River.

Brief history: The start of construction was planned for 1936 with operation to begin at the end of 1939. However, in 1948 auxiliary structures were being constructed and a major part of the excavation work was apparently done in 1946-47. At the end of 1952, construction work was indicated as nearing completion, but the power station was still under construction.

Brief description: The river is not navigable—so the dam serves only for production of power. The headworks consists of a rock-fill dam having a maximum height above riverbed and above foundations of 15.5 meters, a length of 163 meters of which 105 meters is length at crown. An earth dam of maximum height of 5.5 meters and 164 meters length is involved as is a water intake, 30 meters wide, with an automatic spillway. The diversion canal is 18.4 kilometers long, of which about 7 kilometers is open canals and aqueducts and 11.3 kilometers of tunnels. The capacity is 60 cubic meters per second. The power installations do, or will, include 6 vertical, 45,000-kilowatt Francis turbines coupled with 43,000-kilowatt generators. An auxiliary circuit consists of a generator driven by a Pelton turbine. The power will be fed into the Armenian and Trans-Caucasian networks.

Capacity: Lake Sevan, into which 27 rivers and streams flow, but only the Razdan River flows out, serves as a natural reservoir.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Proposed 260,000 kilowatts (1936); proposed 214,000 kilowatts (1947).

Electric output (kilowatt-hour/year) proposed: 861 million kilowatt-hours (1936) for average year; 1 billion kilowatt-hours (1936) in dry years to cover shortages elsewhere; 930 million kilowatt-hours (1947).

Some facts relating to cost: Materials used: The estimated volume of work is:

Rock and earth work, \$3,600,000 cubic meters.

Tunnel excavation, 480,000 cubic meters.

Concrete work, 650,000 cubic meters.

Metal structures (headworks dam only), 290 cubic meters.

Selected references: Meyer, R. A., *Gyumushskaya Gidrostantsiya Sevano-Zanginskogo Kaskada, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1936, No. 10, pages 30-35; Kechek, K., *Kanakirskaya Ges, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1934, No. 9, pages 25-33.

PROJECT: FARKHAD DAM

Location: On the Syr-Dariya River, at the Begovat Rapids, in the Fergana Valley, near Khikovo Railroad station and 14 kilometers upstream and east of the town of Begovat, 160 kilometers southeast of Tashkent on the border of Uzbek and the Tadzhik SSR.

Brief history: Work began in 1942 and the first stage of the power plant started operations in 1947. In 1948 the second generating unit was not yet in operation.

Brief description: A concrete spillway dam with 8 stony gates rises 26 to 28 meters in height above the river bed and foundations. It is 100 meters along the spillway. The spillway part of the dam is connected

with a 410-meter long and 28 meter non-overflow earth dam which becomes an embankment on the left bank of the river. There are no locks. The intake is 80 meters long and leads into a diversion canal 13.8 kilometers long, 40 meters wide at the bottom, 97 meters wide at the top and 12 meters deep which leads to the powerhouse on the left bank of the river, 13.8 kilometers from the dam and in or near the town of Begovat. Installations include 4 units rated for a 32-meter head. An irrigation canal carries the water further into the southern part of the Golodnaya Step'.

Capacity: The reservoir is 60 kilometers long, reaching the town of Leninabad. It has a capacity of 360 million cubic meters.

Electric capacity: 120,000 kilowatts (proposed in 1946).

Electric output: No information available except as may be derived by computation based on the above.

Some facts relating to cost: The first stage of the construction was to involve:

Earth excavation, 14,300,000 cubic meters.

Earth fill, 3,200,000 cubic meters.

Rock work, 260,000 cubic meters.

Concrete and reinforced concrete, including 3,500 tons of steel parts, 288,000 cubic meters.

The earth dam with a 600,000 cubic-meter volume was built by the hydraulic-fill method. The concrete part of the dam was 112,000 cubic-meter volume.

Selected references: Poslavskiy, V. V., Poyarkov, V. F., Simonov, V. M., *Pregrazhdeniye Rusla Reki Syr-Dariya Na Golovnom Uzie Sooruzheniy Farkhadskoy Gidrostantsii, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), No. 3, 1945, pages 4-7; Farkhadstoy, *Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow, No. 12, 1946, page 23.

PROJECT: DNEPR DAM

Location: The dam is immediately upstream from Khortitsa Island in the Dnepr River, below its confluence with the Samara River and about 10 kilometers below the former rapids in this river. It is south of the Kichkas Settlement and near the city of Zaporozh'ye, Zaporozhskaya Oblast', Ukrainian SSR.

Brief history: The first construction started in 1927 and was completed in 1932. Portions of it were substantially demolished in 1943. Reconstruction was started in 1944 and was completed in 1949.

Brief description: This development is the largest hydroelectric power plant in the U. S. S. R. It is a part of the larger projected Dnepr River development which, when completed, will include also Kakhovka Dam and possibly Nikopol' Dam. The dam is a reinforced concrete gravity-arched type with 47 spillway gates. Thickness of the dam at the base is about 40 meters. The piers are 62 meters above the riverbed and the foundation, the spillway 44 meters high. The length of the spillway section is 611 meters, that of the nonoverflow section 250 meters. A three-chamber lock with an estimated freight capacity of 2 million tons per year is located at the left bank; it eliminates the rapids and makes navigation possible. The forebay is partly formed by the powerhouse intake dam, which is 230 meters long and 55.8 meters high. The powerhouse, immediately below the intake dam on the right bank, includes installations of 9 vertical Francis type turbines rated at 106,000 horsepower, 3 of them manufactured in Newport News, Va. There are nine 90,000 kilowatt-amperes, 72,000 kilowatts, 83.3 revolutions per minute generators, 3 of them manufactured by the General Electric Co. The plant is interconnected with the Dnepr and Donbass power networks.

Capacity: The estimated capacity of the reservoir is 3 billion cubic meters. It extends 150 kilometers up the Dnepr River and 100 kilometers up the Samara River. At Dnepro-

petrovsk, about 70 kilometers upstream, the water level is raised 4 meters.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): 558,000 kilowatts (1939); 630,000 kilowatts (peak load); 648,000 kilowatts (planned in 1947); 648,000 kilowatts (achieved in 1949).

Electric output (kilowatt hours per year): 2,058,000,000 kilowatt hours (1939); 2,221,000,000 kilowatt hours (1949); 2,271,000,000 kilowatt hours (estimated 1946).

The powerplant is expected to work 5,000 hours a year providing the forebay level is at 52 meters elevation and the flow is 200 cubic meters per second.

Some facts relating to cost: For the dam, 2,800,000 cubic meters of rock and earth were used or excavated and 1,200,000 cubic meters of concrete were laid. For the lock, 2,050,000 cubic meters of earth and rock were used or excavated and 150,000 cubic meters of concrete laid. For the powerhouse the figures were 1,500,000 cubic meters of earth and 1,900,000 cubic meters of rock.

Selected references: Rudenko, A. A., *Meropriyatiya Po Vosstanovleniyu Plotiny, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1946, No. 3, page 20; Intserov, D. D. *Razrusheniye I Sostoyaniye Utselevshikh Konstruktsiy Gidrostantsii, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1946, No. 3, page 24; Kandalov, I. I., *Dneprostroy V 1946 G., Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow) No. 3, 1947, page 6; Chernogubovskiy, Z. P. *Vosstanovleniye Elektricheskoy Chasti Dneprovskoy Gidroeletrostantsii Imeni Lenina, Elektrichestvo* (Moscow), 1947, No. 1, page 35.

PROJECT: BUKHTARMA

Location: On the Irtysh River, near Ust'-Bukhtarma slightly below the confluence with the Bukhtarma, in the eastern part of Kazakhstan.

Brief history: Reported as under construction in 1955. Basic hydraulic work was reported as begun in 1954.

Brief description: The concrete dam is to be nearly 100 meters high. Another Soviet report says the dam will be the world's tallest.

Capacity: The prospective reservoir has been reported by Soviet sources as the world's largest, some 500 kilometers in length including Zaysan Lake, with one estimate of 30 billion cubic meters.

It is said that it will supply twice as much power as the Ust'-Kamenogorsk plant. Estimates range from a high of 520,000 kilowatts to a minimum of 283,000 kilowatts capacity and an estimated output of 2,450,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

Some facts relating to cost: It is reported that the cofferdam will be 600 meters long and 12 to 15 meters high. Some 3,000 tons of steel will be used for cutoffs and more than 150,000 cubic meters of earth and brick will be placed.

Selected references: Krutikov, I., *On the Upper Irtysh*, Pravda, June 29, 1954, page 2.

PROJECT: ANGARA

Location: In the region of the so-called dip, where the difference of about 30 meters exists between the upper and lower levels of the Angara River, some 10 kilometers from the city of Irkutsk, Irkutskaya, Oblast' RSFSR.

Brief history: The Angarstroy project of 1936 considered the construction, on the Angara River alone, of 6 large hydro projects with a total capacity of 9 million kilowatts and an annual output of 61,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours. With 7 additional projects on tributaries the planned capacity would be increased to 12 million kilowatts. It was planned to build the first hydroelectric plant at the outflow of Angara from Baykal.

The war years halted whatever work had been started. The postwar plans involved some modification and instead of 2 upper projects, 1 hydroelectric power station is being built, the first of several. Work, prelim-

inary or otherwise, was resumed in 1949 and this first plant is now under construction.

Brief description: According to incomplete data the development will utilize an earth-gravel fill dam of over 10 million cubic meter volume. Another Soviet source indicates that it will be 65 to 80 feet above the river and will require more than 350 million cubic feet of fill. There will be no spillway dam—surplus water will be discharged through an aperture made inside the reinforced concrete powerhouse. A navigation lock will be included. Much mention is made of the low temperatures of winter, up to 40°.

Capacity: The reservoir behind the dam will reach Lake Baykal, which in itself has a surface area of 33,000 square kilometers. The level of Baykal will, it is reported, be raised by 1.5 meters. Dmitriyevskiy in an early report indicates that the initial capacity of the plant is determined at 435,000 kilowatts and the multiannual average of yearly output at 3,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours. A more recent official statement is that it will produce more than twice the amount of energy generated at the Dnepr which is variously indicated between 558,000 and 648,000 kilowatts.

Some facts relating to cost: What must have been a very preliminary 1937 estimate of the cost of construction of the Angara (Baykalskaya) hydro installation was given by Dmitriyevskiy as follows:

Dam, 215 million rubles.

Powerhouse, 62,200,000 rubles.

Navigation locks, 64,200,000 rubles.

Electrical equipment, 132 million rubles.

Construction cost total, 822 million rubles.

"Excluding the items, amortization of which will not be covered by power delivered, the replacement cost of installations is estimated at 632,300,000 rubles. On the basis of this amount, capital investment per 1 kilowatt of installed capacity is estimated at 1,054 rubles or 16.6 kopecks per 1 kilowatt-hour of generated power.

"In calculating the production cost of power, total amount of annual operational expenses is estimated at 16,700,000 rubles; assuming the annual production of the powerplant at 3.8 billion kilowatt-hours, the cost of 1 kilowatt-hour at the busbars of the step-up substation will be 0.44 kopecks."

It perhaps should be noted that in 1955 it was complained (see Batenchuk in sources) that mainly because of trouble with regard to spare parts: " * * * the operations of earth excavators and cranes cost the construction last year 1,600,000 rubles more than was foreseen by the plan."

Selected references: Lebed', A. and Yakovlev, B., *Angarstroy*, chap. VIII, pages 140-144, in *Transportnoye Znacheneye Gidrotekhnicheskikh Sooruzheniy*, series 1, No. 4, Institut Po Izucheniye Istorii I Kul'tury SSSR, Munich, 1944; Batenchuk, Ye., *Obstacles to a Complete Utilization of Technical Equipment at the Angaragesstroy*, Pravda, April 3, 1955, page 2; Dmitriyevskiy, P. M., *Baykal'skaya Hydraulic Installation on Angara River, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo*, October 1937, No. 10, pages 27-32.

PROJECT: VOTKINSK

Location: On the Kama River near Votkinsk, Udmurtskaya ASSR, RSFSR.

Brief history: The building of embankments was reported as rapidly progressing in October 1954.

Brief description: The spillway dam will raise the water level 24 meters. There are also two large earth dams, a powerhouse and two reinforced concrete two-chamber ship locks.

Capacity: The reservoir is indicated as a large one, several times the size of the Moskva Sea.

¹ From Dmitriyevskiy, see sources listed.

The power plant is claimed by the Soviets to be one of the largest being built in the country.

Some facts related to cost: 20 million cubic meters of soil will be dug from the river and dams filled with 16 million cubic meters of dirt. Some 7,850,000 cubic meters of concrete will be needed for the spillway dam and ship lock.

Selected references: At the Construction of the Votkinsk Hydroelectric Power Plant, Pravda, August 16, 1954, page 1.

PROJECT: SHIROKOVSKAYA DAM

Location: This dam is located on the Kos'-va River, a left-bank tributary of the Kama River, about 20 kilometers upstream and southeast of the town of Gubakha in the Molotovskaya Oblast.

Brief history: Work on this dam started in 1942, with the building of a coffer dam. The foundation pit was excavated in 1943. The underwater concrete parts of the dam were built in 1944. In 1945 or 1946 the rock-fill dam was built and the reinforced concrete structures were completed. The first generating unit was put into operation in 1946 or 1947.

Brief description: The dam consists of four interrelated parts. There is a right-bank, rock-fill dam, about 40 meters high, which is 81.5 meters thick at the base and 280 meters in length at the crown. The spillway dam, 37 meters thick at the base and 40 meters in length, is 29 meters above the river bed and 35 meters above the foundation. It is of buttress type made of reinforced concrete shell and filled with rubble and gravel. There is a powerhouse dam, partly of the gravity type, 26.4 meters in length and 47 meters in height above the foundation. A left-bank nonoverflow dam 81.5 meters in length varies between 17 and 27 meters in height above foundation. There are no navigation locks. Two vertical Francis turbines are coupled with generators. The station is connected with the Molotov power system which supplies the northwestern region of Uralenergo.

Capacity: Total capacity of the reservoir is 526 million cubic meters with an available draft of 350 million cubic meters, which is about 15 percent of the yearly flow.

Electric capacity (kilovolt-ampere) proposed: No information available.

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/years) proposed: 130 million kilowatt-hours for an average year was proposed in 1945.

Some facts relating to cost:

Total volume of excavation and construction work included:

Earth and rock excavations, 195,000 cubic meters.

Filling and fillers, 102,000 cubic meters.

Loam layers, 18,000 cubic meters.

Rock-fill and rock-layers, 215,000 cubic meters.

Dry rubble and wet rubble masonry, 34,000 cubic meters.

Concrete, rubble stone concrete and reinforced concrete, 86,000 cubic meters.

Facings and aprons, 17,600 square meters.

Mechanisms and steel reinforcements, 1,630 tons.

Selected references: Lavrishchev, A. N., *Ekonomika Urala I Stroitel'stvo Malykh I Srednikh Gidrostantsiy* (Moscow), Gosplanizdat 1945, pages 36-38; Razin, N. V., *Gidrostantsiya S Kamennno-Nabrosnoy Plotinoi, Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1950, No. 7, pages 9-15.

PROJECT: NOVOSIBIRSK

Location: On the Ob' River 30 kilometers south of Novosibirsk in Western Siberia. Hamlets of Verkhniye and Nizhniye Chemy and Ogurtsovo are nearby.

Brief history: In August 1955 the cofferdam was already built and some of the reinforcing

frames erected and concrete poured for the foundation.

Brief description: A 5-kilometer earth dam is involved, built in large part, apparently, by hydraulic fill. The short reinforced concrete spillway dam, about 160 meters long, will have 8 spillway spans.

A three-chamber lock and navigation canal will be included.

Capacity: The Ob' Sea will be about 240 kilometers long and 20 to 22 kilometers in width and will cover 1,300 square kilometers, displacing many people.

Electric capacity (kilovolt - amperes): Large.

Some facts related to cost: About 8 million cubic meters of earth will be involved in the dam; in all more than 11 million cubic meters of earth will be moved; 125,000 cubic meters of concrete will be involved in the powerhouse and locks. Some 7,500 tons of metal piling will be driven.

Selected references: Ugreninov, N., First Hydroelectric Power Plant on the Ob' River, *Stroitel'naya Gazeta*, October 22, 1954, page 1.

PROJECT: NIVA III

Location: In the Arctic region of Murmanskaya Oblast, RSFSR, on the Niva River between Lake Plesozero and Kandalaksha Bay, about 13 kilometers from the mouth of the river.

Brief history: Construction of the dam was started in 1937; work was interrupted by the war; reconstruction work started in 1945; the plant was put in operation sometime between 1946 and 1950.

Brief description: The main and only function of the dam is to form a head and pondage for its powerplant. There is no artificial reservoir. The main storage reservoir for the Niva River regulation is formed by Lake Imandra.

The dam is a nonoverflow, crib-earth dam with a concrete spillway, and diversion installations. The maximum height of the dam is 19 meters and length of the earth dam at crown is 263 meters. The length of the spillway is 50 meters. It is rated for 150 cubic meters per second flow and has two control gates 12 by 8 meters. A headrace intake, a headrace upper flume 110 meters long, a headrace tunnel 2,690 meters long, and a headrace lower flume 1,178 meters long are involved. Power installation includes 4 vertical Francis turbines and 4 generators. The plant will apparently supply a variety of local consumers and will be interconnected with the Niva II and Tuloma Hydroelectric power plants. There are no locks.

Capacity: There is no artificial reservoir. Electric capacity (kilovolt-amperes): Planned, 120,000 kilowatts (1936); planned, 150,000 kilowatts (1939).

Electric output (kilowatt-hours/year): Estimated, 750 million kilowatt-hour (1935).

Some factors relating to cost: Work and materials involved include the following:

Earth and rock used for embankment, 318,000 cubic meters.

Morainic soil excavated, 553,000 cubic meters.

Rock excavated, 419,000 cubic meters.

Rock excavated from tunnels, 578,000 cubic meters.

Concrete and reinforced concrete work, 186,000 cubic meters.

Crib cofferdam work, 46,000 cubic meters. Steel construction work, 2,400 tons.

Selected references: *Gidroelektrostantsiya Niva III*, *Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel' stvo* (Moscow), 1947, No. 1, page 29; Vasil'nev, A. F., *iz Opyta Stroitel'stva Tunneley Nivskoy Gidroelektrostantsii*, *Gidrotekhnicheskoye Stroitel'stvo* (Moscow), 1948, No. 8, pages 20-24.

PROJECT: GOR'KIY

Location: At Vasilevo Village, near the town of Gorodets, 44 kilometers from Balakhna and about 50 kilometers above

Gor'kiy on the Volga River in Gor'kouskaya Oblast', RSFSR.

Brief history. This project began in 1933 and under original plans was to be completed in 1938-39. It was indicated as under construction, perhaps only started, in 1948. It was for some unascertained reason reported as near completion in mid-1952. As of early 1955 it was reported that the main earth excavation work had been completed and that more than half of steel structures and built-in parts had been installed. The project was about to enter the preoperational period. As late as April it was still estimated that five generating units would be put in operation in 1955, but one had been reported as manufactured as early as December 1952.

Brief description: It will comprise a concrete spillway dam about 336 meters long, an earth dam erected by the hydraulic-fill method of approximately 1,200 meters length, embankments with a total length of at least 11 kilometers, even a total of 18 kilometers of earth dams according to one source. There are to be two lines of navigation locks to make simultaneous movement upstream and downstream possible without interruption, also a 3 square kilometer basin for repair and winter anchorage. There will be a docking area.

Capacity: The reservoir will be 5 times larger than the Moscow Sea and cover at least 150,000 hectares, perhaps 179,000 hectares. It will raise the water all the way to Shcherbakov, a distance of 350 kilometers. Water level in the Volga will be raised by 8 to 10 meters, according to most sources, but according to one, by 18 meters. Over 10,000 rural and town buildings, many industrial enterprises, hundreds of kilometers of highways and communication lines have been or are being translocated.

Some facts relating to cost: Excavating or filling required more than 30 million cubic meters of earth (50 million cubic meters were mentioned by one source), twice the amount of earthwork undertaken at Dnepr. Concrete in the amount of 1,300,000 cubic meters will be required by the powerhouse dam and lock along with 100,000 tons of reinforcement. About 17,000 tons of metal structures were required. The construction has been indicated by the Soviet sources as highly mechanized; i. e., 90 percent of all production processes, 98 percent of the earthwork and 100 percent of the concrete work.

Selected references: Orlov, P. P., Near the City of Gor'kiy, *Nauka i Zhizn*, No. 6, June 1954, pages 4-6; Yurinov, D., Year of Decision for the Construction Project, *Pravda*, No. 99, April 9, 1954, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] to extend his remarks.

(Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, "pie in the sky" has been defined as a theoretical reward at some future time for an effort expended now. The ethereal benefits are ill-designed and incapable of definition. The sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project, unable to contradict the plain arithmetic involved in the calculations for repayment, have tortured "pie in the sky" with such a complex arithmetic and such a devious rationalization of likely benefits, that it is impossible to extract from this political hocus-pocus the relevant facts related to what are called indirect benefits. Our forefathers,

simple and direct as they were, early realized that an expenditure of community funds must be related to direct returns which would be readily observed. During the 1930's the theory of indirect benefits was superimposed upon what had previously been a clear and understandable economic theory. Out of this new concept of "pie in the sky," there emerged what came to be known as the so-called benefit-cost ratio. Although benefit-cost ratio has no standing in the law, it has been the lever used by the Bureau of Reclamation since the 1930's in claiming economic as distinguished from financial justification of projects.

"Benefit-cost ratio" means in simple terms a ratio between the various economic benefits alleged to stem from a project and the cost of that project in actual dollars and cents. Obviously, if the ratio is to mean anything, the two items must in some manner be comparable. There must be some common yardstick which can be placed on both the alleged financially usive benefits and also upon the known cost in taxpayers' dollars. The sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project have not attempted to relate the two in any understandable manner, but have measured each factor of the ratio by entirely different criteria. It follows that the ratio obtained is completely meaningless and misleading.

The genesis of the "pie in the sky" social and economic philosophy on which this comparison of the incomparable is based, has never been more brazenly stated than in a report of President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950, and I quote:

Financial feasibility is not the same as economic feasibility. * * * For this reason the Commission is recommending that Congress eliminate the requirement that irrigation projects show financial feasibility * * * the principle of full reimbursement has ceased to be useful or necessary. The Government has come to be recognized as an agency for social and economic action which need not follow the rules of the private capital market * * * social benefits and national interests should be clearly differentiated from those for which reimbursement should be required. * * * Where the public interest is clearly established, public expenditures to promote it cannot properly be regarded as subsidies. * * * The justification for public investment in irrigation is that there are public ends to be attained which the commercial price system cannot reflect."

Such terms as "social benefits," "public ends," and "national interests," have no more determination in financial terms than would the terms "private ends" and "family interests," when used by a private individual in attempting to obtain a personal loan. The projection of such terms in calculations of reimbursability raise the obvious question of who is to determine their value. Upon whom is to rest the responsibility of translating vague uncertainties into realistic terms? In the present instance it would not be elected public servants of the people who are directly responsible to those whom they represent for the careful husbandry of public funds. To the contrary, it would be the bureaucrats who love dearly to spend more and more public money

under almost unlimited terms of discretion, and who have never demonstrated a dedication to careful fiscal scrutiny or rigid economy in the expenditure of public moneys. Together with the agencies and bureaus, representatives of the beneficiary States themselves would comprise the formal court of review and the agency for the interpretation and translation of benefit-cost. These would be in every sense of the words, *ex parte* judgments from which there would be no court of appeal and no review. The presumptions already adopted in this connection are so great that it has resulted in the sponsors of the act telling taxpayers in States far from the scene of the project what they themselves stand to gain in selling more automobiles, carpet sweepers, and baby carriages to families subsidized at the rate of \$5,000 an acre.

The Engineers' Joint Council, a group including representatives of five of the great engineering societies of the Nation, had this to say of the benefit-cost ratio in a statement—*Principles of a Sound National Water Policy*—issued in 1951:

Increases in trade and commerce have usually been computed on the gross volume of new business without recognition of the fact that there is no benefit to be derived from the mere circulation of money. Actually, for such benefits to accrue, there must be tangible gains to those who transport, process, and distribute goods to the ultimate consumer, all without increased cost to him.

The conclusion of the Engineers' Joint Council, it would seem, must be the consensus of all people who believe in honest and understandable public accounting:

Direct benefits should be limited to those new and increased values which are definitely measurable. Such tangible offsets to cost, under ordinary business standards, would be limited to the capitalized value or present worth of future net revenues to be derived from operation of the works constructed.

The estimates of agricultural benefits have been challenged from many sources and one of the strong dissents was made by the Department of Agriculture in a review of the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado River storage project. Also the Bureau of the Budget, in reporting on the initial project recommended by Secretary McKay, specified that the economic justification of all of the 11 reclamation projects should be reexamined in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

One example of the abuse of the benefit-cost ratio is in the Bureau of Reclamation's estimates for the Seedskaadee project. It is claimed that there are indirect benefits of \$638,500, public benefits of \$313,100, and direct benefits of \$614,500. When all these are added and compared with the cost in real dollars of expenditure, a benefit-cost ratio of 1.46 to 1 is reached. Thus it is easy to see that if only direct benefits were considered, the ratio would betray the unsoundness of the project. Now let us see what these so-called indirect and public benefits are. Indirect benefits are "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project, and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers." Public benefits are "increase or improvement in settlement and investment

opportunities, community facilities, and stabilization of the local and regional economy."

It is difficult to find a proper characterization for an agency employed by the Government to serve the interests of the Nation which could seriously place a monetary estimate upon such a jumble of indeterminates as this.

The Bureau's estimate on the Hammond project is a benefit of \$41.50 per acre per year. The Bureau also estimates that the irrigation farmers on the project will be able to pay only \$2.02 per acre per year for water. Thus the direct benefits would seem to be 20 times the farmers' ability to pay.

It should be noted that in the recent report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, which the President transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1956, it is recommended that only direct or primary benefits be used in the calculation of benefit-cost ratios and that the evaluation period be limited to 50 years. In contrast, the Reclamation Bureau has included large indirect or secondary benefits evaluated over a 100-year period.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] in his remarks demonstrated, I think, something that would justify in my opinion the recommitment of this bill at the proper time to the committee for further study. I agree with the distinguished gentleman that there has been a lot of confusion and apparently in the last few months or the last 2 or 3 years we now have some experts on most everything that could happen in this great part of the country. It seems however, that even the experts become confused about the true situation.

It is not a pleasant duty for me to stand here and oppose the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], a very fine man, a very fair chairman. I might say the same thing for the distinguished gentleman on the other side when he was the chairman of this great committee.

We have had a lot of discussion from the experts here. I would like to just bring to the attention of the House some of the little fundamental things—maybe they do not mean a whole lot, but on the other hand they might have a considerable bearing on this project and its feasibility.

I say to the Members of this House that I do not think this is a feasible project.

We have had a great deal of discussion about a substance that is found in the canyon walls where you are going to store up this water; I believe it is called Chinle shale. I think everybody recognizes the presence of it. It is merely a question of how many miles of it are in the river banks of the area that is going to be the reservoir, if you please.

I hold in my hand here first a report from a man who allegedly is an expert on these matters. I also have some of the shale that came from the part of the river that was examined by this distinguished gentleman.

As I hold it up for you to look at it seems like pretty solid material, but let us see what happens to it when you put a little bit of it in water as I do now.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALEY. Not at this time.

Let us see what the expert says about this shale:

The Chinle shale is exposed along the canyon walls of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers for an aggregate distance of about 50 river miles within the proposed reservoir area. Its importance to the proposed reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navajo sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks.

If brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir this Chinle shale, which now is partially protected in canyon walls above the river level, would immediately disintegrate and flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks in extensive areas bordering the proposed reservoir. All of the broken debris resulting from this collapse would move downslope and would partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in these extensive areas of Chinle outcrop.

Chinle shale is not thin. According to H. D. Miser—

He is quoting from the United States Geological Survey Water Supply Paper No. 538—

this formation has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River. Its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the nearby Colorado River appears to be similar.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. UDALL. The little nuggets of shale that the gentleman put in the water there, I am sure, are going to dissolve because I come from a Chinle shale district. Does the gentleman know that geologists state without contradiction that beds of Chinle shale are not permeable, that water cannot penetrate such beds?

Mr. HALEY. Probably the gentleman is an expert. I do not know. However, the document I have been reading from was written by a man who supposedly is an authority on the matter. I am a layman as you gentleman are and I, as you, must depend on the experts and authorities for scientific information.

Now, let us look at what is left in this experiment. Here is what will be left when the water permeates the shale—mud. I say you will get that in the reservoir or the river, and even a Missouri River catfish cannot live in that mud.

Mr. Chairman, Echo Park was originally in this bill and they will tell you that now it is out. I say it is not out and if it is out then you do not have a feasible project.

I would like to read from a report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, serial No. 11, page 24, wherein Mr. Tudor, who was Under Secretary of the Interior, was testifying. In response

to the following question from Mr. ENGLE, Mr. Tudor said:

We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, yes, sir.

Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of the automobile then?

Mr. TUDOR. I might say it might be like taking the pistons out.

So, if Echo Park is no longer a part of this project, then it, the project, is not a feasible project. The statements I have read are statements made by your expert who came here to testify for the project. All that you have before you is the testimony of these men. In referring to the feasibility of this project, Mr. Tudor, who was then the Assistant Secretary of the Interior said that without Echo Park the project is not a feasible project.

In response to a question by Chairman MILLER, he said:

Mr. TUDOR. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in a hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative submitted.

So have we got a feasible project? I say that we have not.

Now, let us see what they say they are going to grow on these lands and what it is going to cost the taxpayer. They say it is going to be paid back. When? Not during your or my lifetime. You heard the projects read off here, and some of them are going to be 26 years in the building. So, you do not have to worry about this project so far as you or I are concerned; they are not going to be paid back even during your children's lifetime, and they know it.

Let us see what they are going to raise on these acres, on these projects that they are building now. Oh, yes, they are looking way into the future, but we have in this country better than 20 million acres of land that could be brought into production at a fraction of the cost of this land. According to the testimony before our committee, we have approximately 20 million acres of land on the eastern side of the Mississippi River that could be brought into production. So why go out there? The gentleman said something about not raising bananas on Pike's Peak. Well, with the amount of money that you are spending out there, you ought to raise something other than what they are going to produce.

Let us see what these acres of land that are going to cost you from \$1500 to \$3000 per acre will produce. Mr. CHENOWETH—and he qualified his witness—in asking this question of Mr. Clyde, made the following statement:

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment Mr. Clyde and Mr. Stringham on their very fine statements.

Mr. Clyde, you are recognized as an authority on reclamation. I am interested in the cost per acre that Mr. PILLION asked you about. It seems that opponents of reclamation are using the cost per acre as one of their principal weapons in their efforts to defeat the authorization of all reclamation projects. What is your theory in figuring the cost per acre? Should our thinking be revised? Is there some loophole here? Are the costs actual and factual, and can they be defended?

Mr. CLYDE. Congressman CHENOWETH, the costs are high. That is a part of the price we have to pay.

Let us see how much or how costly these acres are. Mr. CHENOWETH goes on and says:

What could we do to change that formula?

He is talking about the formula on which reclamation projects, I presume, are built.

Mr. CLYDE. I think we cannot change the formula. I think we have to admit that there are indirect benefits which are not measured in the dollar cost.

You take, for example, central Utah. If you take the cost of that project of \$127 million, as I remember the figures, and divide it by some 240,000 acres which includes the Indian lands, you get a figure of \$624 an acre.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You show \$627?

Mr. CLYDE. \$627, thank you.

Now, that \$627 is the figure you get by dividing that \$127 million by that number of acres.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That does not include interest?

Mr. CLYDE. That does not include interest. But look at the benefits coming to the community, the State, and the Nation as a result of that."

Now Mr. DAWSON of Utah, tried to determine the cost per acre from Mr. Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board:

Mr. DAWSON. Are you opposed to using power revenues to help defray the cost of irrigation projects?

Mr. MATTHEW. No, sir, not if it is set up in the proper way.

Mr. DAWSON. So it is just simply a matter of degree. You think in this particular case they are probably going a little too far; is that it?

Mr. MATTHEW. Well, it is quite a way, yes.

Mr. DAWSON. So you feel \$2,500 an acre subsidy is a fair figure, too, do you?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes. I think it would be more than that. Incidentally, I think that in answer to a question propounded by Senator KUCHEL at the Senate hearings, the Bureau of Reclamation has already reported that the accumulated debt for the projects recommended by the Secretary, that is, 2 storage units and 11 participating projects, would be over a billion dollars over the repayment period. If you divide that by 366,000 acres that would be benefited, it would be over \$3,000 an acre. So the \$2,500 figure an acre is conservative.

Now, on this high-price land, bear in mind that the President has asked the Congress to pass a soil-bank program. So let us see what has been the past history of the production of the lands brought into use by other projects that have been initiated and completed by the Bureau of Reclamation. I think that no one can question that we will have similar production of commodities in this proposed project and reading from the 1953 crop summary and related data from the table on page 26 of the Bureau of Reclamation report as to commodities produced, many of which are now in surplus. So we now have this kind of a situation where there has been requested that we retire approximately 40 million acres of land in order to diminish the surplus commodities. We find this situation in the report. There are approximately 66 million bushels of corn, barley, oats, rye, wheat, sorghum, and other crops produced. We find that for pasture hay, fodder, and similar crops the report shows that approximately 12 million tons were produced in 1953. We also find in the same report that cotton is produced to the extent of 980,000 tons.

The same report indicates that approximately 42 million bags of 100 pounds of potatoes were produced. Citrus, which we have an abundance of in this country at the moment, were produced in the amount of 8¼ million hundredweight. So the statement that this land will not produce anything substantial that is not now in surplus is incorrect.

Does it make sense to continue to bring land into cultivation to produce crops which are now in surplus and for which at the moment at least cannot be used and merely means that the surpluses that we now have cannot be disposed of on the market of our country or the markets of the world.

One of the justifications of this project has been that the Navaho Indians will be benefitted by its construction. On page 562 of the hearings, identified as part II, it is plainly indicated by the following testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that in order to assist the Navaho Indians the taxpayers are called upon to sponsor a project which would cost \$200,000 per Indian family. I call your attention to the remarks by Mr. Clyde and Mr. PILLION appearing on page 562:

Mr. CLYDE. Yes; I still think it would be a very marked fabrication.

Mr. PILLION. But you do not say that the figures submitted by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in which he estimated the cost of that project at \$211 million to resettle or to irrigate farms to take care of the 1,100 families, you would not say that that was a fabrication; would you?

Mr. CLYDE. I am not familiar with the figures there, Mr. PILLION. I do know that it is an expensive project.

Mr. PILLION. At \$200,000 per family it is a rather expensive project; is it not?

Mr. CLYDE. I would not wish to substantiate that in my testimony. I would like to figure it first.

I, too, am concerned about the status of our Indian population, but I do not think that this large expenditure of money would assist the Navaho Indians. As a matter of economy if this amount was necessary per family, why not deposit the money in the bank where it would draw 4½ or 5 percent interest, therefore giving to each Navaho family an income of approximately \$10,000 a year and allow them to buy with such income many of the things that are in surplus crops?

There is no justification for this project insofar as the Navahos are concerned on this kind of basis. It would be much better to allow the Navaho Indian to draw his Government-issue blanket around him and sit on it than to try to assist him in this manner.

The entire Colorado River storage project should be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study until such time as a determination can be made as to its feasibility both from an engineering and economic standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the demonstration you have just seen here involved some rock nuggets of Chinle shale which come from my congressional district. I was born and grew up in the Chinle shale country, and I will have a bit to say about that subject later.

However, at this point, since they want opinion of expert geologists, I am going to insert following these remarks a statement by a geologist from the University of Arizona who just completed a master's thesis on Chinle shale, and a statement by the regional geologist of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. J. Neil Murdock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get permission to insert someone else's remarks when the Committee rises.

Mr. UDALL. Very well; I shall do so. In any event, I will have a good deal to say, and if the gentleman will let me use his equipment, I have a piece of Chinle shale that was not picked up on the surface of the ground, but is a core from a diamond drill at the actual site of Glen Canyon Dam, and after my demonstration I will drink whatever remains of the water after I finish my speech. So, I think we can satisfy the Members on this Chinle shale proposition.

TUCSON, ARIZ., February 5, 1956.

Hon. Senator WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Upon returning to town, I read two articles in the Los Angeles Times which distressed me very much. They were in regard to the Glen Canyon Dam site. Copies of these articles are enclosed with my letter.

I was astounded to hear that the Chinle clays were detrimental to the Glen Canyon project. I have recently completed a 2-year study on the Chinle formation in northeastern Arizona as a thesis problem for my doctor of philosophy degree in geology at the University of Arizona. It is true that the beds containing bentonitic clay will disintegrate when placed in water but—the penetration of water into these beds is practically nil. Unless a current is present to remove the finely divided wet clay the penetration of the water will be on the order of 2 to 3 feet. Some slumping will take place along steep cliffs. In my study of the Chinle in the Navaho Reservation, it was shown that only about 10 percent of the beds contained sufficient bentonitic clay to cause prominent disintegration. There is no Chinle close enough to the dam site to interfere in any way with construction or operation. My conclusion to Representative HOSMER's statements as reported in the Los Angeles Times is that he has absolutely no basis for any criticism in regard to the Chinle formation.

You should have Representative HOSMER tell about the uranium deposits which will be covered by the lake. I believe less than 1 percent of the entire Chinle outcrop will be submerged.

You may wonder why I have written this letter so hurriedly. Since I was one of the Bureau of Reclamation geologists who did the field work on the Glen Canyon project, I feel that Representative HOSMER's statements are an attack on my professional reputation and on the reputations of two of the best engineering geologists in this country or the world for that matter—Roger Rhoades, who reviewed the work, and Glen Lasson, who supervised the work. Since I am no longer in the Government service, I feel free to speak out against those who put their personal desires above the truth. I admire the

work you have done in trying to straighten out some of the inaccuracies which have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If there is anything I can do to help produce a factual picture of the geologic conditions on the Glen Canyon project, I would be glad to do so. I can be contacted at 17058 Upland Avenue, Fontana, Calif.; phone Valley 2-6102 for the next 2 months.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. WILSON,
Geological Engineer.

STATEMENT BY GEOLOGIST J. NEIL MURDOCK,
REGIONAL GEOLOGIST OF THE BUREAU OF
RECLAMATION, ON LANDSLIDES AND THE
CHINLE SHALE

I feel it is entirely possible some landslides will develop in the Glen Canyon Reservoir but these should in no way impair the operation of the project. These would be very minor and could only occur in the upstream reach of the reservoir, as it is 40 airline miles (70 river miles) from the dam to the first shale formations.

Landslides into reservoirs are a common occurrence. They have occurred countless times in many operating projects. Grand Coulee Dam is a good example. Even during the construction of the dam a clay deposit on one abutment had to be stabilized by freezing to permit construction to proceed. A long stretch of highway had to be relocated because landslides into the reservoir took it out. Out of 75 miles of highway, landslides partly or wholly destroyed 13 miles.¹ Yet the reservoir has operated continuously and with no impairment to its efficiency.

Geologic conditions at Coulee are more unfavorable than the Chinle formation at Glen Canyon. The sediments at Grand Coulee are unconsolidated clay and silt of glacial origin. They are highly plastic and flow readily when saturated. This is in contrast to the Chinle shale which supports high sandstone cliffs even when subjected to the erosive action of fast running water.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

(Mr. SHUFORD asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are considering H. R. 3383, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. This bill was favorably reported with amendments on July 8, 1955, by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and a rule was thereafter granted by the Rules Committee. However, the bill did not come on for consideration by the House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. The committee's explanation of that bill and the committee's conclusions and recommendations are embodied in House Report No. 1087. Three separate minority reports opposing the measure were filed to accompany the report on H. R. 3383.

On February 8 of this year, some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on H. R. 3383, a majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considered and approved amendments to that bill. These amendments in effect constitute a new bill. We are asked that

the same be substituted in lieu of the original bill.

The proponents of the Colorado River project must have realized the deficiency of H. R. 3383 and felt that it needed strengthening. One of the amendments and changes in the original bill is to make more positive the elimination of Echo Park Dam. There was language in the original bill to that effect, nevertheless, that language apparently was not deemed sufficient by those who objected to an invasion of one of our great national monuments and the establishment by such action of a dangerous precedent.

It is correctly stated in the minority views in the supplementary report that this Congress cannot bind a future Congress. The correcting sentence added to section 3 of the bill may be all that the committee can do legislatively, but it is not all that the committee can do under its power of inquiry. Based upon testimony at the committee hearings, Echo Park Dam and Reservoir will have to be included in the upper Colorado River project at some subsequent date in order, even on paper, to make the project feasible.

Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor testified before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 83d Congress in reference to Echo Park Dam. He said that taking the Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado River project would be like taking the pistons out of the engine of an automobile.

Fourteen months later Reclamation Bureau Commissioner Wilbur A. Dexheimer, when asked: "Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economical feasibility of the upper Colorado River project?" answered:

Yes. Although by elimination of parts of the project the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin.

And later Commissioner Dexheimer stated:

It—

Echo Park—

is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan.

From testimony such as this one cannot help but conclude that the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir will some day be included in the project unless further study is had upon the bill to ascertain whether or not an alternate site for Echo Park Dam is possible. The committee was advised that there are such alternate sites even better than the Echo Park site. The proponents of these alternate sites were enthusiastic in their recommendation of the same. We, likewise, had advice that there were no alternate sites for the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir and that ultimately it must be constructed and made a part and parcel of the project as essential to the upper reaches of the area.

¹ Report by Fred O. Jones, Geologist, U. S. Geological Survey, landslide conditions along the Ferry County Highway paralleling Lake Roosevelt from Kettle Falls to the mouth of the Spokane River, Wash. U. S. Bureau of Reclamation files.

The construction of the Echo Park Dam is highly controversial. Since some of the proponents of the Colorado River project feel that it should be included, I think this bill should be recommitted for further study, to the end that that question could be finally resolved. By so doing it can be fairly said that our foresight is better than our hindsight.

The bill contemplates the use of water for municipalities, and though that appears to be a reimbursable item, nevertheless, such a provision seems to me to be an inequitable advantage to the four States here involved. I do not feel that these States should receive such a benefit for purely municipal purposes over and above that allowed or permitted in the other States of the Union outside of the reclamation area. In nearly every State municipalities are required to finance their water supply on less favorable terms than granted in this bill. There is no provision of law of which I am aware that will aid the other States to secure municipal water at Government expense to be repaid on such favorable terms as granted in this bill.

Great stress is made by the proponents of this bill of the need of electric power for the future development of the States involved. Granting that to be true, for the sake of argument, nevertheless it appears from the testimony before the committee that the future needs of the area for electrical power have been and will be provided.

Several private utility companies who now furnish power for the four participating States filed a statement with the committee in which the following appears:

Furthermore, ever-growing needs for electric power in each of our States will provide a market for the power which the project will produce, provided the new generating facilities are put into production on a schedule in consonance with the growing demands for power. We have consistently kept abreast of these growing needs through the construction of additional generating capacity and the extension of our transmission systems. Our plans for the future necessarily entail continuous additions to our generating and transmission capacity so that we shall always be in a position to fill growing needs. To the extent to which project power becomes available to us at costs reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs, we would be relieved of the cost of constructing an equivalent amount of generating capacity and might be relieved from operating (except for peak and reserve generation) some of the older and higher cost generating plants on our own systems.

In other words the project will shift to the taxpayers throughout the United States the burden of cost now planned and contemplated by private utilities who frankly say they are presently generating a sufficient amount of power for the needs of the area and will meet the future needs as they arise.

The proponents of this bill thought it was ready for passage in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, but during the recess between the 1st and 2d sessions of that Congress they found reason to make additional changes which they say improves the bill. The changes are important and far reaching. If the bill was improved by the study made of it in 7 months, I am satisfied it can be

further improved by additional study and consideration at a later date.

The present bill proposed to supply supplemental water for 243,000 acres of land presently in cultivation, and to irrigate 143,000 acres of new land at a total cost of \$320 million. It was stressed in the committee that this land is vitally needed for the economy of the country. It seems strange, indeed, that on the one hand one department of our Government should recommend a soil bank for the withdrawal of acreage from production and the spending of large sums of money for that purpose, and on the other hand another department of our Government should recommend a project which would bring into cultivation additional lands which certainly are not needed and at such a terrific cost as herein specified.

The Bureau of Reclamation presented to the committee cost figures for the initial participating projects. As far as I can find out, the cost allocated to irrigation in this project varied from \$210 to \$794 per acre, or an average of over \$400 per acre. We were informed that little of this land, even with sufficient water, would command a fair market value as high as this. Costs estimated for some 22 other possible participating projects, on the basis of only partial investigation, runs as high or higher, and up to \$1,530 per acre in one instance.

The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed for a low of \$50 per acre and a high not in excess of \$150 per acre. According to the Soil Conservation Service there are 2,686,518 acres of good idle land in farms of the five States of Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. Many other millions of acres are available in other sections. In my own State of North Carolina figures obtained from the same source shows there are 4,264,763 acres of good idle cropland in its farms. This is fine land in classes 1, 2, and 3 only. The total does not include woodlands, pastures, or Government lands.

We are told that the land to be brought into productivity by this project will not increase our surpluses for that none of the basic crops under support will be raised thereon. The bill makes no provision in this regard. I understand, however, it is proposed to make use of the land for the raising of alfalfa, and other hay crops, and a small amount of corn, all for the purpose of providing feed for livestock, which is about the most unprofitable use which could be made of irrigated land. In my opinion, such use of the land would have an adverse effect on the dairy- and beef-cattle industry which is suffering sorely at the present.

Mr. Chairman, I have not undertaken to discuss here all the objections I have to the bill. It is not necessary. I have only sought to bring to the attention of this body a few reasons for my objection.

It seems unreal to obligate the taxpayers of this great country of ours in the manner proposed in this legislation. I appreciate the enthusiasm of the proponents of the upper Colorado River

project, but taking into consideration our obligations and commitments I do not think that this bill should pass.

The cost of this project has been estimated in various amounts. The bill carries an authorization of \$760 million. Based on the Bureau of Reclamation estimates, the estimated cost of the project would amount to \$933,468,300, and the construction costs of all the projects covered by the bill would amount to approximately \$1,600,000,000. No provision is made in these figures of hidden interest subsidies which must be borne by the taxpayers.

As stated in one of the minority reports, I think the Colorado River storage project, as here proposed, is one which is uneconomical and unnecessary, and will not contribute to our national economic growth, but on the contrary will constitute a handicap and a drain on the Nation's purse. I sincerely hope the bill will be recommitted for further study.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, it shall be my purpose in the few minutes allotted to me to discuss briefly some of the legal problems which must be resolved before further consideration should be given to the construction of dams and reservoirs for the permanent diversion of additional waters from the Colorado River.

This is a phase that has not been discussed by the proponents of the bill. They have chosen to ignore it mainly because it is devastating and it would defeat the bill.

The State of Arizona filed a suit against the State of California for the purpose of quieting title to certain waters to which the State of Arizona lays claim. The State of Nevada intervened as an interested party and so did the United States Government, both asserting claims inconsistent with those of both Arizona and California. Some of the issues which must be resolved in this controversy will include:

First, full interpretation of the Colorado River compact; second, the meaning and the effect of the compact between the State of California and the United States in which Arizona and Nevada are third party beneficiaries; third, and this is perhaps of tantamount importance—the quantity of the water which is legally and physically available for beneficial consumptive use in the lower basin. This will involve questions of fact and questions of law which will also involve the burden of the Mexican Water Treaty.

While it is true that most of the water available in the lower basin comes from the upper basin, the Gila River, lying wholly within the lower basin, must be considered as a tributary of the Colorado River and waters taken from the Gila River for use in Arizona must be chargeable to Arizona's entitlement from the whole system. It is true that much more is used by Arizona from the Gila River than normally reaches the main stream of the river in its native state. The court must determine whether the 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum made available under article 3A of the Colorado River

Compact to the lower basin is exclusive of all waters generated in the tributaries flowing into the main stream below Lee's Ferry or whether they are inclusive. If the court holds that they are inclusive, then the water of the Gila River, now completely used by Arizona must be chargeable against the Arizona entitlement under the compact. Actually, Arizona is not a member of the compact.

The pending suit must determine whether consumptive use of water is to be measured in terms of the quantity consumed in the growing of crops and by domestic use or whether it is to be measured in terms of the resulting depletion of the virgin flow of the main stream. The United States Government in its intervenor is claiming a paramount right to water from the Colorado River for the Indians. It must be admitted by all parties that the Federal Government did not relinquish its Indian claims at the time the Colorado River compact was approved. The question to be resolved is the quantity of water the Court will allot to the Indians in the lower basin. The Federal Government is claiming that it must have more than 13 million acre-feet available in the lower basin for the following purposes: First, 1,700,000 acre-feet for the use of Indians in the lower basin; second, 1,500,000 acre-feet to take care of the Mexican Water Treaty; third, 700,000 acre-feet for evaporation on Lake Mead; fourth, 8,500,000 acre-feet to fulfill its contract obligations to California, Arizona, and Nevada; fifth, an undetermined amount for public domain, fish and wildlife, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, etc.

This amounts to 12,400,000 acre-feet exclusive of the undetermined claims of the Federal Government, which could well exceed another million acre-feet. This total figure exceeds the average flow below Lee's Ferry. The Federal Government has contracts to deliver 5,362,000 acre-feet annually to the State of California, 300,000 acre-feet annually to the State of Nevada, and 2,800,000 acre-feet annually to the State of Arizona.

The bill before us provides that in the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam the upper basin States are obligated to release 75 million acre-feet in each 10-year period or an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. Under such an arrangement the Federal Government would find itself short 50 million acre-feet of water in each 10-year period or an average of 5 million acre-feet a year, short of fulfilling the Federal obligations.

The Federal Government claims that in spite of congressional approval of the Colorado River compact it has never relinquished the water rights. If the State of Arizona and the Federal Government are successful in their claims, California's entitlement would be reduced by over 1,500,000 acre-feet. The coastal area embraced by the metropolitan water district has an entitlement of 1,212,000 acre-feet a year which could be completely wiped out by the pending court action provided the upper basin States were not compelled to release at least

12,500,000 acre-feet to flow by Lee's Ferry. The upper basin States are not a party to the suit and would not be bound by the Supreme Court's decision, and if the Supreme Court holds in the present case that 12,500,000 acre-feet must flow past Lee's Ferry they would have to file a suit against the upper basin States to enforce its decree and if enforced, there would not be one drop of water available for the Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir, and you would have a 600-foot pile of concrete standing as a monument to the folly of Congress.

I do not agree with the Government's position in the matter or say that I would not agree with the Supreme Court decision; I say only that it is not impossible that the litigation should be resolved in favor of the Federal Government.

This then is the legal state in which we find ourselves. To reduce it to simplicity, let me say that no man among you would consider building a 13-story building with his own money upon a parcel of land, the title to which was under attack in the court, for you might very well find that after you had built the building the court would say that it was constructed on land that did not belong to you and your entire investment would be lost. Why then should you deal with the taxpayers' money in any other way than you would your own?

So I want again to call your attention to the fact that this whole thing is in dispute in the courts, and it would be mere folly if we were to go ahead and complete the project at the present time even though the administration favors this bill. Maybe one part of the administration favors it, but another, the Department of Justice, on the other hand, is saying here, "We want 12 million acre-feet of the water from the upper basin"; and if that should turn out to be the case there will be no water for Glen Canyon or for any other proposition. So the Federal Government is not a unit in support of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go into all these questions raised or answer the propaganda literature that has come out; there is just too much of it.

Back in 1922 the seven States at a meeting at Santa Fe, N. Mex., signed a compact providing for the distribution of the waters of the Colorado River.

The State of Colorado produces 72 percent of all the water of that river. Notwithstanding that, the three lower basin States, California, Arizona, and Nevada, were allocated half of the water, which was estimated to be 15 million acre-feet annually. So the lower basin States got 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. As early as possible they got into construction and developed Boulder Dam and many other projects.

We of the upper basin States, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, had difficulty allocating our half of the water. Eventually we reached a decision. In the

meantime California not only used the water allocated to it but, because none of the upper basin States had a way to impound the water, California used that for the generation of power and sold it at a very low figure to the power companies in Los Angeles. As I recall the last figures, the amount paid was around \$50 million. That was money that the upper basin States were entitled to because the water was that of the upper basin States.

There has been all kinds of opposition to this bill, and I mean that part giving anything at all to the upper basin States. But it has been approved by everybody in authority. The President of the United States, I assume after consulting with officials who knew the conditions, recommended on 3 or 4 occasions, the last time this morning, the passage of this legislation.

The Colorado River development project bill, like most other forward looking legislation which has come before the Congress since the days of the Founding Fathers, is encountering bitter opposition based upon selfishness, greed, and lack of understanding. Its opponents have attacked it in much the same language as was used by the opposition to soil conservation, rural electrification, and other similar programs which have contributed so vitally to our country's enormous economic upsurge. It is high time that we penetrate this camouflage of propaganda with which the opponents of this bill have sought to becloud it, in the hope of blocking its enactment. Fortunately the propaganda has been so transparent, groundless, and at times so absurd as to defeat their purpose.

The height of absurdity was reached in desperation by the opposition when one of its southern California power interests spokesmen proposed that we should resort to the services of so-called rainmakers in the upper basin States and abandon any plan for utilization and conservation of the Colorado River waters. I shall not attempt to add further insult to the intelligence of the Members of this honorable body by making a detailed reply to such a weird proposal. We in the Southwest have had experience—disillusioning and unsatisfactory experience—with rainmakers. Our drought-plagued farmers and ranchers have paid them thousands of dollars. Ask those ranchers and farmers about rainmaking. Their answers may not be polite, but they will be forceful.

Incidentally, the upper basin States are not seeking for more water through this legislation. They merely want to conserve and utilize the water which rightfully is theirs and which is now flowing down the Colorado River to generate electricity for southern California power interests, over and above the amount to which they are entitled.

The sole purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with construction of facilities on the upper Colorado River that will permit beneficial use of the water. This utilization would consist of generation of electrical energy, irrigation of lands, and even more important, making water supplies available for municipalities and industries in an area

where economic progress has been seriously hampered by shortage of water and power.

The first requirement for legislation of this type must be that it is in the public interest. That should be the requirement for any sound legislation. When I speak of public interest I do not mean that it should benefit 1 group of people or 1 area to the exclusion of others, but that we must measure such proposals as this with a nationwide yardstick. The primary question, then, that we have before us is whether all of the American people will be benefited by the development of this upper Colorado River. Let us consider that.

The upper Colorado River and its tributaries traverse what is known as the Colorado Plateau. That is the only source of water supply for this area of 100,000 square miles of which 24,000 are in Colorado, 31,000 in Utah, 27,000 in Arizona and 19,000 in New Mexico, according to the records of the United States Geological Survey. The Bureau of Land Management estimates that approximately 75 percent of the nearly 65 million acres in the Colorado Plateau are owned or controlled by the Federal Government. In other words three-fourths of this land belongs directly to all the American people—not just to those of the individual States where the lands are located. The principal income from those 65 million acres and the resources on or under them, therefore, goes to the Federal Government for the benefit of the Nation's taxpayers. That is not an unusual condition in the public lands States of the West.

In regard to the Colorado Plateau, however, it becomes particularly significant when we consider the fact that from this area comes virtually all of the domestic supply of uranium for the successful operation of our atomic-energy program, in which the citizens of this country have invested nearly \$15 billion since its inception. Domestic sources of uranium outside of the Colorado Plateau, so far as they have been discovered today, are negligible. Without Colorado Plateau uranium we would be entirely dependent upon imports in event of war or other emergency, at a time when our foreign supply of uranium would be radically reduced or entirely cut off. The \$15 billion investment of the American people thus would be rendered virtually ineffective for our defense, or the continued economic development of our Nation. In this atomic age that would mean disaster, probably the most widespread and complete that has ever confronted us. It could spell total defeat for us.

According to the records of the AEC uranium production and processing, virtually all in the Colorado Plateau area, has passed the \$100 million-a-year scale of operations. It probably is nearer double that today. For security reasons we cannot say what this means in terms of the overall atomic energy program. It can be said, however, that we have about reached the maximum uranium production and processing possible in this area until additional and more constant water and power resources are made available.

There is only one way in which this can be done and that is by construction of the projects authorized by this legislation. Let me repeat that this is the only water resource in that vital area. In other words, our atomic energy eggs are all in this one basket.

Any man with a modicum of business sense would agree, I am sure, that reasonable investment by the American people to protect, expand and assure future success of a \$15 billion atomic energy program would be fully justified. Most certainly a plan for financing that development which provides for an original Government investment of \$760 million, of which more than \$752 million is self-liquidating, much of it with interest, must be recognized as good business. There is no giveaway of the people's money involved. All this talk about a cost of billions to the taxpayers is as false as it is foolish. No one knows that better than those who are doing the talking.

Simple arithmetic blows their false argument sky high. This bill authorizes a construction program investment of \$760 million over a period estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation as approximating 25 years. That means an average investment of about \$30 million a year. The Bureau of Reclamation conservatively estimates that an average of 60 percent of this amount will come from the reclamation fund, which is derived in considerable degree from production of minerals and oil on the public lands and from the sale of those public lands. A good percentage of that fund comes from the four upper basin States themselves, all of them key public lands States.

That means that \$18 million of the annual requirements will come from the reclamation fund and only \$12 million out of the general fund in the Treasury, virtually all of it reimbursable. Thus that claim is an unjustified burden on the Nation's taxpayers evaporates into smog-free air.

Those taxpayers are not as fortunate, however, when they are forced to pay \$348 million for a flood control project that protects only Los Angeles. Please bear in mind that none of this money is reimbursable. It is an outright giveaway to southern California's metropolis. It all comes out of the people's pockets. I do not mean to imply I am opposed to flood control projects. I vote for every meritorious project as a member of the Public Works Flood Control Subcommittee. But I do object most strenuously to southern California's willingness to accept this gift from the Nation with one hand and knife the upper basin States development project with the other.

If the Colorado plateau promised nothing further than the development of its rich uranium resources, which geologists generally agree may easily be the world's greatest, enactment of this legislation would not only be justified but mandatory. The 100,000 square miles also have a vast potential in production of oil and gas, coal, oilshale, lead, zinc, copper, and many other minerals that have brought from many expert sources, both Government and private, a conservative ap-

praisal of its economic value running high into the billions of dollars. It is often characterized as nature's most valuable storehouse of resources in the United States. Production of oil and gas, for instance, cannot be definitely estimated for the entire area, but the partially developed oil and gas resources in northwestern New Mexico may be reasonably accepted as a basis for calculation. That one small part of the Colorado Plateau has a reserve of 11 trillion cubic feet of gas. In that field alone 151 billion cubic feet of natural gas was produced in 1954, with a value at the well of 6.1 cents per thousand cubic feet. Oil production averages about 95,000 barrels of crude per month with a current value of about \$2.50 per barrel. The annual value of the oil and gas production from this one field is considerably in excess of \$12 million.

In this same area the United States Government has a helium-gas plant which makes an important contribution to this Nation's supply of that rare and most valuable strategic commodity, so essential to our defense program. Other oil and gas discoveries are constantly being made in Utah and Colorado which bear out the opinion of geologists that the Colorado Plateau eventually will be one of the Nation's greatest sources of those products. That development will be impossible without adequate water supply.

The return to the American people—to the Treasury of the United States to lighten the tax burden of the Nation—from the development of this vast potential is almost incalculable. I can assure you that the State of New Mexico would be delighted to finance its share of the proposed upper Colorado River development, if the Congress would approve legislation turning over to the upper basin States the rich Federal holdings in the Colorado Plateau and the full income from them. I am equally sure that every other upper basin State would be willing to do the same. We could build a dozen Colorado River development projects and still turn a surplus of millions every year into our State treasuries. Yet, we encounter bitter and unreasoning opposition to this legislation, which will give our States but a fraction of the benefits that all of the American people will derive from the resulting development.

I can understand why southern California power interests, for instance, are resorting to every trick, fair or foul, in the legislative book to defeat this bill. For many years they have waxed fat from electrical energy derived from the waters belonging to the upper basin States that flow down the Colorado River through Hoover Dam outlets. Excess profits from energy developed by this upper basin water over the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually allotted to the lower basin States under the Colorado River compact, which the power interests have obtained at a so-called dump rate, has given them a windfall of at least \$41 million—undoubtedly much more—in addition to the many other millions they make from primary contract energy. Naturally they do not want to lose this

bonanza, regardless of the hardship it works on their neighbors along the Colorado River and on the rest of the Nation. Worst of all, fully half of this water, which rightfully belongs to the upper basin States is flowing eventually into the Pacific Ocean after it has turned the turbines at Hoover Dam. This waste of our water resources has been going on for three decades. To the water-starved and drought-stricken States in the upper Colorado Basin, now helpless to protect themselves, this can be regarded as nothing less than an outrage. Southern California vested power interests are reaching into the pocket of every taxpayer in the Nation when they seek to further deprive the Colorado Plateau of the water which it must have to continue its development. The American people are being defrauded. Only the proper conservation and utilization of the Colorado River waters in the upper basin can properly protect their interests. It is manifestly the obligation of the Congress to enact this legislation in furtherance of the public interest.

A few minutes ago I heard one of our delightful Members say that there were many millions of acres east of the Mississippi River, why not develop them? I will tell you one reason why some of the people in the northern basin should have some water.

About 1862 or 1863 when the Navaho Indians were having difficulty getting food because strange faces had come into that area and killed off that which they had for food prior thereto, they got rather upset about it and killed some of the whites. After years they were rounded up. They were not from New Mexico. They were the nomads of the West, from California, Nevada, and all the States west. What did they do with them? They put them in a stockade at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., and after some years moved them to the location they are occupying now, part in Arizona and the other part in New Mexico. We have at least 60,000 Indians in that area.

They say: "Well, you do not need water that comes by the hand of God. Get it from rainmakers."

Mr. Chairman, all we are asking here is what we are entitled to and nothing more.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I say that the Navaho Indians were confined in a concentration camp at Fort Sumner for 5 years.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman. The situation in my State of New Mexico and the other States concerned is about the same. The richest area of the world is what I am speaking about now, the upper northwest corner of New Mexico where it joins Utah, Arizona, and Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that the uranium industry in the United States is approaching very close to the

\$200 million figure and that the whole industry is based upon the production of raw uranium ore very near 90 percent of which is taken from this very area?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true. In addition to that, we could supply the other 5 or 10 percent, because we have sufficient ore in McKinley, San Juan, and neighboring counties in New Mexico to supply the needs of the United States whether they be in war or in peace or both.

Now, I am not a chemist. I am not going to go through any chemistry demonstration with you or attempt to test out anything, but I do know what is required by way of water to process 1 ton of uranium ore. It needs up to 4 tons of water. We have one processing plant in McKinley County, New Mexico, and we would like to have another, but we do not have the water to treat the uranium.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that the gentleman is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in this Congress?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. And I want to say this to you, that the most important, the most valuable laboratory in the world is at Los Alamos, N. Mex. That is where the first atomic bomb was assembled. We have \$15 billion of the people's money invested in atomic energy and hydrogen energy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me the greatest distance uranium ore is being hauled today for processing?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, I will say probably 150 miles.

Mr. GROSS. 150 miles is the greatest distance?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I mean by truck.

Mr. GROSS. By truck?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. By train how far is it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would not know, but very little in New Mexico is hauled by train.

Mr. GROSS. Where is the uranium now being mined in the Rocky Mountain area being processed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is being processed near Grants, N. Mex.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the uranium ore is broken down into concentrates.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right.

Mr. ASPINALL. And they are shipped out, for instance, from Grand Junction, Colo., being the supply center, by railroad.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thought the gentleman was asking me about New Mexico.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered how far it is being hauled anywhere in the country.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We will get to that. I cannot yield any further. I am sorry.

Mr. GROSS. What I am thinking of, you might ship some into Iowa. We would like to have some industry in

Iowa as well as New Mexico or the Rocky Mountain area.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We will soon give away a billion dollars worth to foreign countries of some of the uranium that we get from New Mexico. I assume that is important, or it would not be done. But, we have invested \$15 billion, and what did it do? Well, before the atom was split, before the know-how existed to make a bomb out of uranium, I suppose we thought of an amount equal to the national debt of the United States, which is about \$280 billion now. But it did not take that much. But it does take money.

Now, we have the Navaho Indians in New Mexico and Arizona. We need water in the development of home building. They build 400 houses at a time for a lot of people coming in to work in these uranium fields. And we have not a lot of land to put into cultivation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, the upper Colorado River Basin embraces an area of approximately 110,000 square miles, and consists of mountains, deserts and valleys, as well as many important cities and towns. This area is contained in five States, which are commonly known as the upper Colorado River Basin States. They are Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah, although Arizona is usually regarded as a lower-basin State.

The bill before the House today is the result of long, tedious study and prolonged negotiations between the water leaders of the upper-basin States. It was natural to expect a divergence of views and opinions, with each State anxious to protect and preserve its water rights.

There have been many differences of opinion, and even disunity at times, with respect to the methods to be pursued in developing the resources of this great river. It has taken a long period of years to resolve these differences and to agree upon upper river basin development program which would insure the maximum benefits for the largest number of people. Great credit is due all of those who participated in these negotiations. Except for their patience and expert knowledge of water problems, and a willingness to make concessions, there would be no bill before us today.

I might state that there has always been complete unity on the necessity and importance of developing the upper Colorado River Basin. The divisions which have occurred have involved details, and not basic principles.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to state to the Committee today that this is a bill having the full support of the four upper-basin States, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These States are completely and unequivocally behind this measure—H. R. 3383—introduced by my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and which authorizes the Colorado River

storage project, and participating projects.

As evidence of the unity which exists on this project, I wish to read letters which I have received from the governors of these four States. These letters contain the reasons why these States are supporting the present bill. It gives me great pleasure to present letters from Hon. Ed. C. Johnson, Governor of Colorado, Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Governor of Utah, Hon. John F. Sims, Governor of New Mexico, and Hon. Milward L. Simpson, Governor of Wyoming. These letters are the best proof of the intense interest in this project in these four States. Each governor gives this project his enthusiastic support and I am sure in doing so reflects the general sentiment to be found in all of the upper-basin States.

I wish to first read the letter from Governor Johnson, of Colorado:

STATE OF COLORADO,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Denver, February 21, 1956.

The Honorable Members of the United States Senate and the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Thirty-five years ago California, searching for an additional irrigation and domestic supply of water and hydroelectric power, undertook the promotion of a Federal project on the Colorado River. California contributed practically no water to this stream, yet through transmountain diversion she planned to put many million acre-feet of its water to beneficial use.

The semiarid States of Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado, who produced this water, were willing this be done provided first a compact among all the States of this river system be ratified by themselves and Congress, allocating to each State including California a specified and proportionate share of the water of the Colorado River system. Otherwise, the water laws of this whole area based as they are on the water doctrine of first in time, first in right would prevail and California having the first construction and use would have the first priority to all the water in this river. California, realizing that there could be no development of the river without the consent of all the States in its system, became the moving spirit and the foremost advocate of such a compact.

The Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, acted as chairman and under his direction a seven-State compact was negotiated and afterward ratified by all the States and the Congress of the United States. Thereupon Hoover Dam was constructed with Federal funds and California began receiving her portion of the water of this river and also the power generated at Hoover Dam.

Among its many other provisions, the compact required the upper-basin States to deliver at Lees Ferry 75 million acre-feet of water in each 10-year period, plus sufficient water to supply the Republic of Mexico.

These required deliveries by the compact gave California and the Republic of Mexico a priority to use of this specific water over all new uses of water in the river system.

Before Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado can use additional water out of the Colorado River system, water which they themselves produce, they must first have storage facilities above Lee's Ferry so that they will be able to meet the burden of water delivery to the lower States which Congress placed on them when it ratified the seven-State compact. When Hoover Dam was built it was understood by everyone, including California and the Congress, that storage facilities would be necessary above Lee's Ferry if the upper States supplying the water were ever to put their water to use. Since the

first concrete financed by Congress was poured in Hoover Dam, the upper States have acted in good faith and have taken it for granted that Congress and all concerned would act in good faith. We still believe that our confidence in Congress and the administration in Washington on this matter has never wavered.

The Colorado River, draining a vast semiarid region, is very erratic in water production. It has a water production varying from 4 million acre-feet annually to more than 20 million acre-feet. The streams feeding this system deliver 80 percent of their water in a 4-month spring flood period. The only way such a river system can be brought under orderly control and the only way the upper States can meet their obligation to the lower States is through the construction of huge storage reservoirs above Lee's Ferry and only the Federal Treasury can finance such gigantic undertakings.

The time has come for the construction of storage facilities above Lee's Ferry at Glen Canyon and elsewhere if there is to be any further development of this river. Unless and until this is done, the upper States are left high and dry and helpless by the very compact which was ratified by them and the Congress in good faith and which they had presumed would give them full and complete protection in the full development of the whole Colorado River Basin.

When Congress built Hoover Dam, it assumed as a matter of equity the obligation to build storage facilities above Lee's Ferry. To have built the one without the other would be the rankest kind of gross favoritism and injustice. Congress is known all over the world for its fairness and for meeting its responsibilities in full.

Water is mankind's most valuable natural resource and all of it everywhere must be conserved. If it is not used for crop production immediately the time will come when it must be so used. As a practical matter the legislation now pending in Congress authorizing storage facilities will not put new land into agricultural production for at least 20 years. H. R. 3383 should be enacted into law now. I hope most earnestly you vote for it.

Sincerely,

ED C. JOHNSON,
Governor of Colorado.

I now read a letter from the Governor of Utah, Hon. J. Bracken Lee:

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, February 21, 1956.

The Honorable Members of the United States Senate and the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: One of the important measures that you will soon be considering is H. R. 3383 which authorizes the development of the Colorado River storage project. Inasmuch as I am well aware of how difficult it is for you to keep thoroughly informed on every bill that comes up before Congress, I thought I would give you information about the aforementioned bill as it affects the great Rocky Mountain empire.

I am certain you are aware that President Eisenhower has endorsed the Colorado River storage project. This project also is endorsed and supported by the Governors and the people of the affected States; namely, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Our very future in the West depends upon this measure since any further growth and expansion of these four States is tied inevitably to the development of this last great water resource of the Rockies.

The Colorado River storage project as it has been planned will pay for itself and, thus, will not be an expense for the Nation's taxpayers but will be an investment. In addition, it will bring untold benefit to the Nation through the new economic resources it will help develop. Our primary interest

in this project, however, is simply to secure for our future growth that one resource which is in short supply in the West—water.

The most vocal opposition to the H. R. 3383 originates in southern California. It seems to be the feeling in that area that the Colorado River storage project will deprive southern California of its share of river water. On the contrary, this bill will not deprive southern California of a drop of its rightful share of the Colorado River water, but will insure a regular and regulated flow of water to meet the lower basin requirements, as outlined in the Colorado River compact of 1922.

It seems there is every important reason to sanction this project and very few real reasons for opposing it. We sincerely hope, therefore, that you will study H. R. 3383 carefully and will keep in mind its vital importance to this area and the Nation when the measure is brought to a vote.

Sincerely yours,

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor of Utah.

I now read a letter from Hon. John F. Simms, Governor of New Mexico:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Santa Fe, February 11, 1956.

Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHENOWETH: I am sure that you either have, or are about to, weigh the merits of H. R. 3383 which would authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. The purpose of this letter is to let you know, before you decide finally what your vote will be, that approval of this bill is of the utmost importance, not only to every person in my State of New Mexico, but also to the Nation as a whole.

As you know, water is our lifeblood. A vast amount of the Colorado River water to which New Mexico and our sister States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming are entitled under existing treaties, is flowing now to southern California and the Pacific Ocean. We desperately need this water for our tremendous defense establishments—such as the Los Alamos Atomic Laboratory and Sandia Special Weapons Center—for irrigation projects which will not contribute to present food surpluses, for Navaho irrigation lands, for development of the San Juan Basin, for hydroelectric power, for domestic and industrial use.

Opposition to H. R. 3383 springs from the understandable desire of California to keep and use all of the Colorado River water which it can get.

It is my hope that when you vote on H. R. 3383 you will keep in mind these things:

1. Simple justice demands a favorable vote.
2. The projects will be self-liquidating.
3. Urgent defense requirements will be met.

4. The Navaho Tribe will be given an opportunity for agricultural rehabilitation.

All of us here in New Mexico will deeply and sincerely appreciate your help and your affirmative vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SIMMS,
Governor.

The last letter I wish to read is from the Governor of Wyoming, Hon. Milward L. Simpson:

WYOMING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne, February 14, 1956.
The Honorable Members of the United States Senate and the Honorable Members of the United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The importance of the Colorado River storage project and participating

projects to my State of Wyoming and to the Nation as a whole cannot be overemphasized.

The upper Colorado River development program is vital if we in Wyoming are to utilize the water to which we are entitled under the 1922 Colorado River compact and the 1948 upper Colorado River Basin compact. This water is essential to allow the agricultural, municipal, and industrial development for which we have such a great potential.

Irrigated land in Wyoming does not produce crops that add to the surplus problem. Irrigation is needed to stabilize our agricultural economy and prevent the necessity of Federal Government drought relief, upon which we have had to rely in the past.

Our vast storehouse of natural resources has barely been touched. The Colorado River storage project would provide the key to a great future for Wyoming. We could take our rightful place in the family of States industrially—not by taking anything away from other areas, but by becoming an area for supply.

I assure you that the entire State of Wyoming is enthusiastically supporting the Colorado River storage project and participating projects—a vitally important piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
Governor.

Mr. Chairman, it has taken 30 years of intensive study and repeated conferences on the part of the water leaders of these 4 States to bring about this agreement and unanimity of purpose. Many water leaders from State and local governmental agencies have also participated in these negotiations over the years, as well as officials of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is indeed a tribute to this entire group that their efforts have succeeded and that we are now considering a bill which has the unqualified support of each State in the upper Colorado River Basin.

Immediately after the approval of the Colorado River compact in 1922, which divided the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the upper basin and the lower basin, the States of the upper basin began working on plans to develop the water which had been apportioned to them under the compact, amounting to 7,500,000 acre-feet per year. It was soon discovered however that it would be impossible to formulate a satisfactory basinwide development plan until the water apportioned to the upper-basin States was allocated among the four States involved. It had been previously determined that a basinwide plan was the only practicable type of development because of the physical nature of the country and the interrelationship of one project with another.

After many meetings and long periods of negotiation, the Commissioners representing Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, and the Federal Government, reached an agreement in 1948, which is known as the upper Colorado River Basin Compact. This compact resolved all of the basic differences between the States on the division of the water allocated to the upper-basin States, and divided this water among these States on the following percentage basis:

Arizona, 50,000 acre-feet.
Colorado, 51.75 percent of the balance.
Utah, 23 percent of the balance.

Wyoming, 14 percent of the balance.

New Mexico, 11.25 percent of the balance.

The bill which we are considering today, H. R. 3383, is based upon the upper Colorado River Basin compact, as well as all of the other agreements and documents which constitute the basic laws and regulations of the Colorado River.

There is no basis whatever to the charge that the lawsuit between Arizona and California, which is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States, shows a lack of unity among the States of the Colorado River Basin, or in any way affects the bill we are now considering. This lawsuit relates only to the water in the lower basin of the Colorado River. It involves water that has been allocated and apportioned to the lower-basin States under the 1922 Colorado River compact. The upper basin States have no interest in this suit. They recognize they are bound by the compact and fully intend to comply with its terms.

On several occasions water interests of southern California have endeavored in vain to force the upper Colorado States into this lower basin controversy between Arizona and California. The upper basin States, by a united effort have successfully resisted such attempts which have been pursued for dilatory purposes in order to delay the passage of this legislation.

The Supreme Court has, twice in recent months, upheld and sustained the position of the upper basin States. On July 25, 1954, California filed a motion with the Supreme Court as parties to the suit, the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. A hearing was held before the Court on this motion on December 6, 1955. On December 12, 1955, the motion was denied—Three Hundred and Fiftieth United States Reports, page 114. In denying the motion the Supreme Court said:

The motion of California to join the States of Colorado and Wyoming as parties to this cause is denied. The motion to join Utah and New Mexico as parties is granted only to the extent of their interest in lower basin waters.

On January 3, 1956, California made another attempt to delay action on this legislation by filing a petition for a rehearing on this motion. The Supreme Court on January 24, 1956, denied the motion for a rehearing. The Supreme Court, by these decisions, has determined the four upper basin States are not necessary parties to the pending litigation between Arizona and California.

The Navaho Indians are also very much interested in this legislation, and have given this project their enthusiastic support. The Navahos comprise a large segment of the population of the States of New Mexico and Arizona. The water which will be made available when this project is completed will bring new life and hope to them. By using this water on their parched land they will be able to grow many agricultural products, which would materially raise their standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to any fair-minded person interested in the development of our natural resources that

now is the time to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project, and participating projects. Further delays are completely unjustified. I hope that the substitute bill will be passed, so that construction of this important project can be started at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] for a unanimous-consent request.

(Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

WHY THE OPPOSITION TO THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND THE STRANGE REASONING BEHIND THEIR OPPOSITION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and trust we will pass it.

For months I have been receiving hundreds of pieces of literature poured out by the opponents of the Colorado River storage project. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been full of it, pamphlets, brochures, and what have you, have deluged our mailboxes, and it is about time this House understands the reasoning behind such unreal, distorted, and actual misinformation being put out through this excessive publicity.

In fact, the arguments have degenerated into a brawl between a well-heeled southern California lobby and the five States, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming, all of these States situated in or partially within the upper basin of the Colorado River.

We wonder sometimes where the southern California interests received all their money to so lavishly build up their opposition of publicity. Could it be because for many years they have had access to the use of water and the millions of dollars' worth of power revenues that have been originating through the upper basin States, thereby actually forming the basis for the wonderful economic progress southern California has made the past two decades?

It must appear to the most casual thinker that the very fact that the upper basin States have provided water for the use of southern California for so many years, with the unused part of it running into the Gulf of California, used by Mexico, or wasted into the Salton Sea, has so confused the leaders of the opposition to the upper Colorado River Basin as to our rights that they positively cannot see the forest for the underbrush. Their rights have been protected, and it certainly is surprising that they should be so distorted in their thinking that they want to refuse the use of the surplus water to the States to which the water belongs. It is not their water and by no stretch of the imagination can they claim it.

Those who oppose H. R. 3383 have gotten themselves so far out on a limb in their opposition and their attacks have been so distorted that I cannot see how any fair-minded Congressman can accept the truth even when accidentally expressed by these exaggerating heroes who propose to save water for southern California—water to which they have no right whatsoever—while they act like a dog in a manger and refuse to let the rightful owners put it to useful purposes.

The attacks by the opposition have gone through several distinct stages of variable and questionable approaches. Most of them disgusting, to say the least. To mention a few—the big breeze in opposition to the Echo Park storage unit—the wild, weird, and absolutely false statements, contrariwise to the thinking of every engineer of any status, that much of the soil bordering the edge of these reservoirs would be composed of such a type of soil that it would disintegrate and run into the lake by its own pressure. How silly can the publicity purveyors of false ideas get? So far out of line has the opposition to this legislation finally directed themselves that they are actually opposing or directly attacking the principles of reclamation itself, in spite of the fact that it has been reclamation that has been the basis of most of the economic development of all southern California.

I venture a statement that in a few years to come southern California and its fine people will wonder what type and kind of leadership they were following when they opposed the development of the upper Colorado River project.

The reclamation law that has for many years been the basis for the many great projects developed in the West seems to me to be above reproach, especially from sections of the country that have received its greatest benefits.

I think I should quote from an address made February 26 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a California Congressman, my colleague CLAIR ENGLE. He said and I quote:

The Californians who object to the project on grounds of subsidy do so in the face of the fact that the major subsidy to the reclamation projects comes not from the Federal Treasury, but from the power users in accordance with regular principles. The Federal subsidy amounts to only \$8.2 million and that for features which are recognized as Federal expenses. Contrast that subsidy with the estimated nonreimbursable Federal cost of \$348 million for only 1 flood-control project in southern California, namely the Los Angeles County drainage area—excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir—and you can get some idea of the reaction of upper basin spokesmen to challenges to the Colorado River storage project based on economics by the California opposition. Thus a single flood-control project which benefits 1 area in California carries a nonreimbursable Federal grant which is over 43 times the subsidy to the Colorado storage project in which 4 States benefit. If it is considered appropriate to take into account the cost to the Federal Government based on the non-interest-bearing irrigation investment, those features of the Colorado River storage projects would cost the United States some \$285 million in interest over the 60-year amortization term. At the end of that period, all Federal costs will have been repaid. The non-reimbursable Federal grant for the Los Angeles County drainage area, on the other hand, will over the same length of time cost the United States \$570 million in interest alone and this interest cost will continue to mount indefinitely. After 100 years, it will amount to \$870 million.

It is interesting to read from the testimony of a certain engineer by the name of Ely for the State of California. He said, and I quote:

The aggregate consumptive use of these projects is said to range from about a half million to about 1½ million acre-feet. These quantities when added to about 2,500,000 acre-feet, said to be required by projects already constructed or authorized, would represent a total use of say 3 million or 4 million acre-feet in the upper basin. The larger of these figures is still within the quantity of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, the use of which is apportioned to the upper basin by article 3 (a) of the Colorado River compact.

In short, southern Californians have never stood up and honestly admitted what they are trying to do. Actually, they are trying to protect the greatest water and power steal of the century by preventing those really entitled to the water from using it. And they are doing this in the face of the fact that they themselves are signers of the Colorado River compact which was formulated to protect upstream interests of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah, and in spite of the fact that lower basin power contracts are predicated upon a consumptive use of water in the upper basin and a diminishing water supply at Hoover Dam.

Just how large is this windfall that southern California is not in any sense of the word either morally or legally entitled to and which she is frantically trying to prevent being utilized by those rightfully entitled to use it? In a letter dated June 10, 1955, to my colleague, Mr. Dawson of Utah, Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. E. G. Nielsen, has laid the answer on the line, as follows:

The Bureau studies anticipated a decrease in the annual water supply available to Lake Mead of 3,949,000 acre-feet between 1938 and 1988, because of increased upstream uses, which is an average of 79,000 acre-feet decrease per year. However, the best information available at the present time indicates no significant decrease in water supply available to Lake Mead, because of increased upstream use. Thus, the amount of water available to Lake Mead during the 1938-54 period has been substantially higher than would have been the case if the increases in upstream use anticipated at the time of negotiation of the power contract had actually materialized.

While depletion estimates cannot be made with an extremely high degree of accuracy, if it is assumed that upstream depletions have been maintained at a constant level from 1938 through 1954, as appears to be the best estimate that can be obtained, the additional water available at Hoover Dam because of inability to increase upstream use, has been about 11 million acre-feet for the 1938-54 period. This additional water is equivalent to about 4.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam powerplant, all of which has been secondary energy, on which the charge to the allottees has been about 1.30 mills per kilowatt-hour (falling water charge of about 0.45 mill and generating charge of about 0.85 mill). The value of this power as fuel replacement in the Los Angeles area is understood to be about 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. The indicated saving of 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour was realized without additional investment, and with only minor transmission losses. The saving to the California allottees of Hoover secondary energy over the period 1938 to date, then approaches \$12 million.

If upstream use is held at the present level throughout the remaining years of the power

contracts, until 1988, the additional water available to Lake Mead for the entire 1938-88 period will have mounted to a total of about 100 million acre-feet. This is equivalent to about 43 billion kilowatt-hours of secondary energy from Hoover powerplant, and on the same basis as above will result in a saving to power allottees approaching \$115 million during their contract period.

Lower basin devotees have on occasion expressed fears that the Colorado River storage project, when constructed, will adversely affect the revenues and payout of Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants. While we are at it, let us lay this ghost, too. General regulations for generation and sale of power in accordance with Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, to which are made subject the power contracts for power generated at Hoover Dam, contain the following provision:

The amount of firm energy for the first year of operation (June 1, 1937, to May 31, 1938, inclusive) is defined as 4,330,000,000 kilowatt-hours delivered at transmission voltage. For every subsequent year the amount defined as firm energy will be decreased by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours from that of the previous year.

The term "secondary energy" wherever used herein means all electrical energy available in any year of operation in excess of the amount of firm energy as hereinabove defined.

Thus, it is glaringly obvious that what southern California has really been belly-aching about is the possibility that she may lose the use of a large amount of firm power at dump-power rates. It should be made clear, however, that anticipated revenues to the United States Treasury from the Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants will not be affected by the plan for the Colorado River storage project. Rate and repayment schedules for Hoover, effective since 1937, contemplate full repayment of reimbursable costs, with nothing added, under the condition of a diminishing water supply over the contract period which ends in 1987. In conformity with the decreasing available water supply is the firm energy production schedule, which decreases each year by 1,000 kilowatts or 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours.

Provisions for periodic adjustment of rates assure repayment of all amounts which will come due during the life of the contract. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, all contracts for Hoover electrical energy recognize the effect of the increasing use of water in the upper basin.

In a similar manner, rate and repayment schedules for the Parker and Davis powerplants anticipate a lessening water supply. The assumed rate of decrease is more severe than contemplated by the plan for the Colorado River storage project. Contracts for energy from Parker and Davis Dams are relatively short-term as contrasted with those at Hoover. Current rates should fully amortize all reimbursable costs. If not, the rates will be periodically adjusted.

Because the plan for the Colorado River storage project and participating projects contemplates storage and consumptive uses of water less severe than the assumed rates of diminished flows

upon which is based the schedule of firm energy production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants, the proposed uses of water in the upper basin will not curtail the firm energy production at the downstream powerplants. The lower basin power users, therefore, at the time they signed contracts for power contemplated a decreasing generation of secondary energy due to upstream uses in the upper basin.

Now, at further "be-smogging" the issue, southern California finds herself knocked out of the ring. Why? Because, gentlemen, as I have stated, the real issue is to be found in the question, Who should get the use of the water and power now used by the lower basin, but to which she is not entitled: Those to whom they both morally and legally belong in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah by the authorization of H. R. 3383 which is before you; or those in southern California who, after having the benefits of using them for 20 years desire to continue at the expense of the industrial, agricultural, and economic development of the upper basin States and the rest of the Nation, which will also receive benefits?

I might add, that if southern California is so anxious to have others wait for the medicine man to make it rain she has plenty of clouds mixed with fertilizing gases to which could be applied rain-making techniques.

There is no basis for the arguments used by southern California in opposing the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, when I heard my good colleague from California a while ago talking about the legalities of this situation, I wondered if I was in the wrong place and we were talking about an Arizona bill. Actually, of course, I wish I had time to give you the Arizona version of this lawsuit, but 5 minutes would not be sufficient to do so. But I should like to dispose of this legal situation, if I may, by stating one very important fact. That fact is that in the case of Arizona against California, the State of California moved to join all of the States of the upper basin as parties. The master who had been appointed by the court found against the motion and thereupon the State of California asked for oral arguments before the Supreme Court.

The question was thoroughly briefed and the Supreme Court, after oral argument, found that there was no issue in the case of Arizona against California which could have any effect whatsoever upon the rights of the States of the upper basin. So I do not believe that anybody here, on this point, wants to second-guess the Supreme Court as to whether or not the case of Arizona against California is important to the passage of this bill. It is not.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Yesterday the question was asked, I believe by the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DIES] whether if the decision in the California-Arizona case went in favor of California it would make any difference in this project, the upper Colorado River project. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will be very glad to answer it, but I do not have to answer it from my own mind. The Supreme Court has already answered it. If I interpret the action of the Supreme Court correctly, the answer is "No." No matter what the decision may be in that case, it will have no effect upon the rights of the States of the upper basin to divert water. Further to answer that question I should like to quote testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in connection with this particular bill. At this time I was conducting a colloquy with Mr. Northcutt Ely, chief counsel of the State of California, in the case of Arizona against California and also the chief witness in behalf of the State of California against this bill. We were talking about the question of transmountain diversion, whether or not it would harm the quality of the water coming down into the lower basin if there were transmountain diversions to the areas of Colorado and Utah across the mountains. I asked this question:

So that has nothing to do with the amount which can be eventually put to beneficial consumptive use in the upper basin. It is still your understanding and your belief that 7½ million acre-feet can be beneficially used in the upper basin without violating the rights of the lower basin?

Here is what Mr. Ely said:

Up to that in any one year, subject to the qualification that we want an adequate study of the effect of transmountain diversions.

With this in the RECORD, I do not know how it is possible at this point to say, as we have heard it said, that the passage of this bill will result in thirst in southern California, that it will dry up southern Arizona and that all sorts of undesirable things will happen if this project is constructed.

How much water will this use? The best estimate we have is that it will actually use in beneficial consumptive use 900,000 acre-feet of water. There will still be all of the water coming down the river which now comes down the river with the exception of 900,000 acre-feet of water. That does not sound like very much to me when you talk about 7½ million acre-feet of water. Actually, as a lower basin State, the State of Arizona should be interested in having the water come down the river. We are interested. We are interested in having 7½ million acre-feet come down that river plus the surplus water to which the lower basin is entitled as set forth by the Santa Fe Compact of 1922. No more, no less.

If you take the arguments of the gentleman from California on this matter, then you would be, in effect, abrogating the Santa Fe Compact. If you defeat this bill for the reasons advanced by the gentlemen from California you would be depriving the States of the upper basin of the right to use water apportioned to

them by that very solemn compact between all of the States of the Colorado Basin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, many logical and sensible reasons have been advanced why the upper Colorado River project, H. R. 3383, should be defeated. I submit herewith 20 pertinent and sound reasons why this bill should not be passed:

First. The upper Colorado River project would bring 580,000 acres of new land into production while at the same time Congress is being asked to approve legislation which would remove more than 40 million acres from production. This does not make sense.

Second. The project would saddle an enormous new tax burden of more than \$4 billion on the Nation's taxpayers. The four States benefiting would pay less than 2 percent of this added tax burden.

Third. The bill proposes that the cost of the power features of the project be repaid in 100 years. With cheap nuclear power just around the corner these gigantic hydroelectric dams would be obsolete by the time they were built.

Fourth. There is no power shortage in the upper Colorado River Basin. When increased industry creates a need for more power, steam plants can be built to supply it at a much cheaper cost than the proposed hydroelectric plants. The largest coal reserves in the world are located in the upper basin States.

Fifth. A 1955 survey shows that in 19 Midwestern and Southern States there are nearly 21 million acres of land now lying idle in farms. This is all first-class agricultural land and could be brought into production at a fraction of the cost of the upper Colorado River project.

Sixth. The project would cost the Nation's taxpayers \$5,000 an acre to put water on land to grow more surplus crops; already the Nation's biggest headache.

Seventh. Secretary of Agriculture Benson said in Kansas City, Mo.:

This is not the time to place a big new block of land in production.

Eighth. Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, key unit of the proposed project, may not hold water or produce power because of physical and geological difficulties which cast doubt on its engineering and financial feasibility.

Ninth. The proposed dams, which are not needed, would cause enormous losses of irreplaceable water through evaporation from the gigantic reservoirs behind them, estimated by the Reclamation Bureau at more than 800,000 acre-feet per annum.

Tenth. The true cost of the proposed project is concealed from Congress. The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least \$4 billion. Reclamation Bureau cost estimates have always been notoriously low, as is revealed by the record.

Eleventh. The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound.

Twelfth. Central Utah—initial phase—the project's largest irrigation segment, is the most infeasible of all.

Thirteenth. The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

Fourteenth. Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project.

Fifteenth. The project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential.

Sixteenth. Echo Park Dam is not removed from the project. Supporters of the project have repeatedly stated that the removal of Echo Park would be tantamount to "removing the pistons from an engine."

Seventeenth. The construction of Glen Canyon Dam will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.

Eighteenth. The bill is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955.

Nineteenth. The project would seriously impair water rights in the lower basin of the Colorado River.

Twentieth. This bill would not assist the Navaho Indians.

I urge the Members of the House to vote against this fantastic project.

(Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in behalf of H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project bill.

I think I have certain special qualifications that enable me to speak objectively on this project. I am from an entirely different section of the country. That means I have no possible sectional interest.

On the other hand, I have visited the upper Colorado River Basin country, the area most directly concerned in this project. My visit just this past summer enabled me to observe and study conditions in that area. I can speak, therefore, with some direct and personal knowledge, and do not have to depend on what I am told by people who are either proponents or opponents of the project.

I am strongly in favor of the project for a number of reasons:

First of all, I know from a lifetime of observation and from a study of history that sound investment in developing the resources of this Nation, wherever they may be located, brings returns to the economy of the entire Nation. Just as the States of the Atlantic seaboard grew and prospered as a result of the opening up of fertile land behind the Appalachians, including my own great State of Illinois, just as we of the Midwest and older States of the East grew and prospered through the expansion farther westward to open up the treasures of the Far West, so will the economy of every corner of this Nation

prosper when we develop the treasure-houses of resources in the upper Colorado River Basin.

I have seen the tremendous development in uranium and other strategic metals and minerals in the upper Colorado Basin. I know that the welfare of the entire Nation will be promoted if the necessary water and power are provided in the upper basin to insure rapid and complete development of these strategic resources. I know the entire Nation will suffer proportionately if this is not done.

I have seen the crops that are grown in the upper Colorado Basin and I know they are not the crops that are now in surplus. Grains grown there are primarily fed to livestock and poultry, and virtually none of them have been placed under price supports—only one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the corn grown there in 1954 went under price support, for example. What they grow are fruits and vegetables, specialty crops, and feed for livestock—nonsurplus crops even today.

A very important point to consider is this; this project if approved, will open vast areas of tremendously rich mineral and oil lands to development. With the present surplus of agricultural products, the opening up of additional land to cultivation does seem at this time to be inopportune. However, it is estimated that it will take from 25 to 30 years to complete this project, at which time it is estimated that the population of the United States will be in excess of 200 million people. There may be a dire need for this additional agricultural production at that future time. Building the Colorado River storage project will not in any way add to the farm surplus problem.

Opponents of the bill state that the project will cost taxpayers of the United States at least \$5 billion before it is completed. The bill we are discussing today will cost approximately \$760 million. Even if it were true that this project would cost \$5 billion, as some opponents have claimed, and the actual cost will be only about one-sixth that amount—we could better spend the \$5 billion on our own undeveloped lands for the good of the taxpayers of this country rather than spend it on undeveloped foreign countries who might some day be our enemies in case of war, and our competitors in world markets in peacetime.

As a Representative from Illinois, I have in the past expressed opposition to this project. This was due at that time to the inclusion of Echo Park Dam, as well as other possible projects which would invade and destroy some of the natural beauties to be found in our national parks and monuments. Any objection I might have had at that time has now been eliminated by the removal of Echo Park Dam from this project, and a personal assurance to me by the proponents of this bill that such a project will never again be included in the development of the upper Colorado River Basin project.

As a resident of Illinois, I have no direct interest in the building of this great reclamation project. But as a resident

of Illinois I know that I will benefit from the development of this area of rich natural resources—just as will the residents of Alabama and Washington, of Maine and Indiana, of Texas and every other State. The entire Nation will, I am convinced, gain by the building of this project—and the entire Nation, I am equally convinced, will lose if we refuse to make this investment in America's future.

I therefore strongly urge this House to approve the legislation now before us.

(Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely understandable why the proponents of the Colorado River storage project seek to divert the attention of the Members of Congress away from the real issues involved and attempt to play up the whole argument as a controversy over the waters of the Colorado River, labeling California as an opponent of the project because she wants all the water for power generation or for uses beyond those permitted her by law and contracts.

The water controversy is at the core of California opposition. Most people probably feel it has little to do with the economic merits of this pending legislation. The States outside the Colorado River Basin feel they are not directly concerned and in general have little if any interest in this water controversy. On the other hand, the 44 States which are not in the upper Colorado River Basin are vitally concerned in the basic merits of this legislation which the proponents seek to gloss over by their charges against California. Is the project justified for authorization in the light of the excessive cost of the undertaking, the fact that it is financially unsound and of highly questionable economic justification and would require a huge hidden Federal subsidy in the amount of at least \$5,000 an acre, which would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers—98 percent of the total subsidy by the 44 States not directly benefited by the project—and the further fact that it would bring into production at least 270,000 acres of new lands while at the same time a soil bank program is proposed to take out of production some 40 million acres of producing farmlands in order to alleviate the problem of surplus crops.

The charge made by the proponents of this bill is a deliberate misrepresentation of California's position. California's primary objection to the proposed upper basin storage project is that under the storage plans contemplated, as revealed in the official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of witnesses at the hearings, California's rights to the use of Colorado River water for irrigation and domestic purposes in southern California would be tragically affected. A recent report made by a

board of consulting engineers to the San Diego Water County Authority concludes that if the upper Colorado River storage project is built as planned, it would result in the loss of at least half of the water supply from the Colorado River for the coastal plain. It is this real invasion of water rights necessary to support a growing civilization now numbering over 6 million people which we cannot countenance. California's legal rights under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act to the consumptive use of Colorado River water for agricultural and domestic uses are at the heart of California's opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project as proposed in the pending bill.

You have heard, or will hear, that the generation of power at Hoover Dam, in which incidentally Arizona and Nevada are substantially interested as well as California, is the real basis for California objections. This is false.

The truth of the matter is that under the plans for the upper basin storage project, it is proposed to store and withhold water in the huge storage reservoirs solely for the generation of power, in direct violation of the Colorado River compact, and in total disregard of rights in the lower basin.

The Colorado River compact—article III (e)—provides as follows:

The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

It further provides—article IV (b):

Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

The record is clear that the upper basin storage project proposes to store and use water in these huge storage reservoirs with the capacity of 30 million acre-feet for the sole purpose of generating power and of securing power revenues to finance irrigation undertakings. The record is clear that the huge reservoirs proposed such as Glen Canyon are not needed in connection with any consumptive use on the irrigation and reclamation projects named in the pending bill. These reservoirs will not be used to put water on the land. This was admitted by Bureau witnesses. At the same time these huge reservoirs would result in a very substantial loss of water by evaporation to the extent of at least 600,000 acre-feet or more annually, which my good friend from Arizona just completely forgot about a few minutes ago when he was telling you how all this water would not be used. Since these huge storage reservoirs would not be needed in connection with actual consumptive use of water for any of the 33 participating projects named in the bill, the building of them now for power generation and the squandering of half of the entitlement of the coastal plain of California by evaporation into thin air, is indefensible.

For your complete information I would like to give you the true picture on the lower basin power contracts, about which our opponents make so much. If all of the water of the Colorado River over and above the amount required for consumptive use in the upper basin in accordance with its entitlement under the compact, is permitted to flow to the lower basin, which is clearly required by the provisions of the compact which I have cited, the incidental production of power at Hoover Dam will take place in complete satisfaction of the power contracts made by the Federal Government with Arizona, California, and Nevada.

The Hoover Dam power contracts are predicated on the expectation of Reclamation Bureau estimates of available water supply and power production over the 50-year contract period or until 1987. The estimates made in 1941 by the Bureau were based upon the anticipation that the available water supply at Hoover Dam would be reduced progressively over the 50-year period by increased consumptive use in the upper basin. Firm power was estimated and defined to be 4,330,000,000 kilowatt-hours starting with the first year of operation in 1937, diminished thereafter by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours each year by reason of upper basin uses. At the same time, the Bureau estimated that even with contemplated increased consumptive use in the upper basin there would be available some 40 billion kilowatt-hours of secondary energy in total over the 50-year period at Hoover Dam. This, of course, is over and above the firm energy which I have mentioned and which the lower basin contractors have a right to expect unless natural causes intervene.

The estimates of power output at Hoover were understood from the outset to be subject to the actual stream flow which depends upon the vagaries of the weather, and also on the actual amount of water diverted for consumptive use in the upper basin under the provisions of the compact. Therefore it was recognized at the outset, and still is recognized, that there is and cannot be any guaranty on the amount of power output at Hoover, which might be affected by these factors. At this moment and for many months past, firm power output at Hoover, to say nothing of secondary, has been cut over 25 percent because Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam is only one-third full—the lowest the reservoir has been since the project first filled. This is because stream flow has been dreadfully low in recent years so that the water must be conserved for domestic and agricultural uses. As it is, the present supply at Hoover Dam is enough only to support these life-giving uses in the lower basin for about 18 months.

No wonder we are concerned by this upper-basin monster. Forget about the power and consider that this project will take water guaranteed to us by Federal contracts a quarter of a century ago for use in the Los Angeles and San Diego area homes, farms, and factories. When we consider that it will take it not for consumptive use but to create gigantic lakes behind power dams for the generation of power in the effort to make these so-called participating projects

look financially feasible, we are outraged. We ought to be. The provisions of the compact of 1922, which I have read, a compact signed by all of these upper-basin States, says that power generation "shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

It is no solace to tell us this bill gives us the right to sue if we are hurt. It should be even less solace to all of the 44 States whose taxpayers will feel the burden of the hidden subsidy in this bill. Whatever semblance of financial sanity there may be in this bill—the New York Times said in an editorial that "no partnership is involved here, presumably because no businessman in his right mind would invest in it"—is keyed into the power revenues the upper basin hopes to get. If a future Court action decides the upper basin must let this water down instead of impounding it for a maximum power head, then the whole shaky house of cards collapses and the entire project will be up for writeoff at the Federal Treasury.

This Congress should not be party to a bill of this magnitude which will violate the rights to use water needed now for consumptive use in the lower basin. California has not objected to and has supported some 10 projects in the last decade in the upper basin. We will continue that support where our rights are not cut in half. This is not one project—it is several dozen in one bill. We must oppose it and we urge you in justice to do likewise.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if there has been any showing here that this project will be different from the other reclamation projects of the West, and that they will not produce crops that are now in surplus? For instance, I have the 1953 summary from the Bureau of Reclamation which shows that during that year corn, barley, oats, wheat, and so forth, were produced on reclamation projects to the extent of 65 million bushels; hay, alfalfa, and other things, approximately 12 million tons and 42 million bags of potatoes. Is there any difference in this project and those?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I cannot see any. As a matter of fact, the amendment that is supposed to be honey to the Midwest people who do not want additional land put into production is said to provide that they are going to take 10 years moratorium on those crops. They cannot produce anything on this land for 10 years that will be a crop in surplus. As a matter of fact, they cannot bring the land into being or into production in 10 years. So that is a phony.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska yesterday attempted to point

out that some terrible organization called the Colorado River Association had been spending some money to oppose this project. I have in my hand a little clipping from the Desert News and Telegram of Salt Lake City, dated January 18, 1956, in which it is stated:

The Utah Water Power Board reported Wednesday it had collected \$21,044 so far as the State's share of the cost of promoting the proposed Colorado River storage project.

Further along it states:

The total collected included \$20,744 for 13 counties.

It is further stated:

The Board said an assessment of \$78,712 had yet to be collected from the other counties as their share of promoting the project.

Under unanimous-consent authority, the full editorial from the Salt Lake, Utah, paper called the Deseret News and Salt Lake Tribune, issue of January 13, 1956, is as follows:

UTAH COLLECTS \$21,044 FOR RIVER PROJECT FIGHT

The Utah Water and Power Board reported Wednesday it had collected \$21,044 so far as the State's share of the cost of promoting the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

The money will be forwarded to the Aqueducts for use in gaining congressional approval of the billion-dollar project.

The total collected included \$20,744 for 13 counties plus a voluntary contribution of \$300 from the Utah Association of County Officials.

The board said an assessment of \$78,712 had yet to be collected from the other counties as their share of promoting the project.

Assessments are based on the counties' property valuation for 1955. The 21 Utah counties most affected by the project were assessed one-tenth of one mill of their property valuation, while the remaining counties were assessed one-twentieth of one mill.

Salt Lake County drew the largest assessment, \$56,936, followed by Utah County, \$10,767; Iron County, \$4,202; Weber County, \$4,018; Carbon County, \$3,147, and Tooele County, \$2,120.

The smallest assessment to help promote the upper Colorado River project was \$69 for tiny Daggett County.

Counties which had paid their assessments were Box Elder, Garfield, Grand, Juab, Plute, Rich, San Juan, Sanpete, Sevier, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, and Washington.

Salt Lake City Corp. had paid an additional \$1,500.

Water and power board officials said they expected little difficulty in collecting the remainder of the assessments.

If Utah had collected \$21,044 at the time the article was written and had \$78,712 more to collect, that totals \$99,756 for Utah alone to pour into "the cost of promoting the upper Colorado River storage project."

Under the upper basin compact formula, Utah gets 21.5 percent of the upper basin's share of the Colorado River water. If funds are being collected on the basis of this water allocation, then the total being raised by all four upper basin States would be \$463,900, a rather sizable sum indeed.

I would like you to consider that figure in relation to any remarks made about California's urgent effort to prevent loss of a substantial share of the water to which she is legally entitled.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Nebraska will agree with me that if all of this money is being put in by one side or the other on this program, the President might very well treat this bill as he treated the gas bill recently and veto it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If you will look at the Legislative Reference Service statement on lobbying, the receipts from the Colorado Water Users Association amount to over a half million dollars.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is in 5 years, the gentleman will note, and it appears on page 3074 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in case anybody wants to look at the statement made by my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Just on that I want to point out that the last report of the Upper Colorado Grassroots' Association, which is lobbying for the project, reportedly spent \$44,853.82 in the first two quarters of 1955. I checked the files on them for any subsequent reports as required by law; and apparently they have not filed such subsequent reports, so that the collections reported by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] are perhaps as current as can be made.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished visitor from Italy today used a phrase which has been echoing in my mind ever since. He spoke of the "disquieting phase of confusion," and I think he chose a very appropriate day and a very appropriate place to use that expression. It should be apparent to everyone in the Chamber and in the Congress that we have a confusing subject, highly technical, and that there is confusion even among the proponents and the opponents upon some of the matters that have come before us. Basically, the situation seems to me to be unchanged.

I shall not attempt to repeat the arguments that have been made upon this floor by other Members who have raised the basic questions as to whether there is enough water and whether it is worth the amount of money involved. I think it is apparent when the vote comes that the majority of the Members of the California delegation will vote in opposition to the bill; that an equal number of Members of Congress from the other Western States will vote for it; and that, therefore, the deciding vote and the responsibility must rest with the Members of Congress who come from the East and from the Middle West. I see my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. Urr] sitting there. He and I entered public life, a little over 23 years ago, at the same moment, in the same room, in California, and we very shortly learned an axiom that may be applied here. That axiom is, When in doubt, a good vote is "No."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I come from that part of the country that produced for you in the four States involved in this debate on the north Colorado River project a great many of your citizens. We went out there in my fathers' time. Some of my children went. I could not get them back home again. Every one of them, though, when they went, knew that there was no water out there. Still, they liked the dry country, the mountain air and the desert.

Before they went, they never dreamed of going around the community and taking by force \$25 from each family for every billion dollars worth of water they wanted to provide for themselves.

You have already taken by force of taxation \$6 billion or \$150 per family on the average for reclamation projects, from every family in my district. And we have not got back a plugged nickel of that. Our families do not believe you are ever going to pay back any of this money. In 53 years, not one of the projects has actually paid out. We can say that the Imperial Valley project is about to pay out. But it has not yet. Furthermore, when and if they ever pay the Reclamation Bureau has the law all rigged up to keep it in a revolving fund to build more unneeded Government projects.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The Salt River project of Arizona paid out its last cent on the original loan to build Roosevelt Dam in December of 1955.

Mr. GWINN. That does not seem to be of record yet. That is the only one, is it not?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not know as to others, but I am sure there must be others.

Mr. GWINN. At any rate, Mr. Raymond Moley in his study of the subject shocked us with these facts. He showed that these projects do not pay out. They simply postpone the day of payment. Here we have one that will take 100 years. What will happen in 100 years?

This whole business of coming into our area and taking our private property to turn it into Government-owned or communalized property is immoral under the American concept of freedom. It would have been immoral for the settlers going west to take people's property. It is no different to take a vote and do the same thing by group assault on us. That concept of immoral conduct is becoming unbearable. Why? Because we are so burdened down by these enforced taxes to set up special Government projects that the rest of us who never get any returns are forced into socialism by the very force of Government itself. In my State we are crying out now for the Government to come into our midst to heal our sick, care for the aged and educate our children. We plead for Washington to bring back some of what was ours in

the first place. We plead against our wills to continue this socializing process in all areas.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close this by saying that I do not believe, if we were all free to vote as our judgment dictates, that this bill would have no better chance than the proverbial snowball. But we Congressmen are not free. Some mysterious, persistent corrupting force puts fear into us. We have thought control from many directions. So I would like to suggest to the other body that is now investigating lobbies, that its investigating committees enlarge their sphere of action. It should include first of all the most powerful, the most numerous, the best financed, the oldest, and I believe the most corrupt lobbies of all. That is some of the bureaus of the Government itself, for example, the Bureau of Reclamation and the collateral forces it commands to influence the enactment of legislation such as this. It may be we will find that the private lobbies, even the rejected \$2,500 oil money for campaign purposes is mere chicken feed compared to the big money, the people's money, the bureaus offer for votes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, on the subject of lobbying, about the amount of lobbying, I placed in the RECORD yesterday the amount of money the Colorado River Association has had, \$1,086,000 in 5 years. Congress has been in session only about 180 days out of the year. That figures \$1,200 for every day that Congress was in session. That is a pretty good sign of the amount of money there was to use for the purpose of lobbying. The Colorado River Association and the other two organizations have spent this average of \$1,200 a day.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yielded to the gentleman when I had the floor. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. My time is gone.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has control of the time. He can yield himself a minute.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield to me?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Briefly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Very briefly. May I point out to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that California is fighting a case in the United States Supreme Court and has been for all these years, and has a right to bring into that money from the public treasury of California to spend on its case.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope I am not asked to yield further in the 10 minutes I have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, on page 3028 of the RECORD of yesterday, it was indicated that on roll-call 9 I failed to respond when my name was called. As a matter of fact, I was here and answered present. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE MUST BE SETTLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the 136th day of the strike by the International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, against the Westinghouse Electric Corp. The company's largest plant is located in east Pittsburgh—which is part of the 30th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent.

For this reason, I should like to review the facts of this nationwide work stoppage which has caused so much misery for so many months.

The International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers has had a contract with Westinghouse since 1950. IUE represents about 31 individual bargaining units in Westinghouse.

The units are scattered from Massachusetts to California and cover more than 50,000 employees.

Most of the employees working in these plants are production and maintenance workers and a number of salaried office workers.

IUE is one of the most militantly anti-Communist unions in the country.

It came into being in 1949 following the expulsion of the United Electrical Workers from the CIO on the grounds that it was Communist-dominated.

The 1954 contract was the first 2-year agreement signed by IUE and Westinghouse.

The union wanted only a 1-year renewal of its national agreement.

Westinghouse insisted on a two-year contract before it would agree to a modified wage adjustment asked by the union.

Early in August 1955, a stoppage of work occurred in the east Pittsburgh plant, provoked by management's attempt to impose a new time study program on day workers. The union felt that this act by the company initiated without consulting or advising the union, was a direct violation of the contract.

On September 12, 1955, the stoppage of work broadened into a national walk-out.

Three days later the company and the union came to an agreement that time study would be considered with wages as a subject for negotiations during the reopening of the contract and the men agreed to go back to work.

Negotiations were renewed and although Westinghouse agreed to discuss these 2 issues they demanded an entirely new 5-year contract and that the present contract with 1 more year to go be junked.

In the Westinghouse industrial dispute the capitalistic system is on trial. We in the United States have accepted certain procedures that are followed to solve our collective-bargaining differences to assure our system will work.

Collective bargaining has been accepted by the employers of America.

When negotiations bog down there are always available State and Federal mediation and conciliation services or impartial arbitration.

In the Westinghouse dispute the company has refused to arbitrate.

This procedure has been successfully used to settle countless industrial disputes not only in the electrical manufacturing industry but in all the other manufacturing industries.

This is the enlightened way used in our highly industrialized society.

This avoids turning back to the dark days when the law of the jungle governed industrial disputes.

In my district—Homestead—the scene of the savage and brutal strike of 1892 occurred.

I rejoice today to see the great steel companies of Homestead settle their grievances around the bargaining table instead of with guns and clubs in the streets of Homestead.

Any strike which involves so many people, lasts so long, and covers so many communities brings misery to the country.

The average workingman has little or no cash reserve for use when disaster strikes.

In this case there has been widespread suffering among the striking workers and their families—in spite of the union's efforts to help the desperate cases.

The disastrous effects of the strike were not long in hitting the merchants in communities where Westinghouse plants are located.

The food stores, the drug stores, the stores where workers were buying necessary articles of furniture and equipment for their homes, have all felt the impact of the strike.

In many cases they are small storekeepers, operating on little capital, and

they are seldom able to extend credit over long periods of time without bankrupting themselves.

Westinghouse stockholders will feel the pinch. While the last regular quarterly dividend was paid on time, there is little likelihood that stockholders will receive an equal amount for the first quarter of this year.

The company itself has lost business it can never hope to recover.

According to *Business Week*, and I quote:

For Westinghouse customers, as well as for the company itself, time is running out.

Dealers and manufacturers are getting only a trickle of appliances and small capital goods from Westinghouse. Cancellations by industrial customers have reached serious proportions only in the last month but this is increasing every day the strike continues.

The loss of potential business is tremendous.

Already Westinghouse inability to deliver essential goods under Government contract has reached the stage where it might be called treason to award them further contracts.

The date for delivery of \$22 million of radar equipment has already passed.

Westinghouse excuses their nonperformance by calling the strike an act of God. Is this an act of God, or is this an act of bad faith on the part of the company.

This strike can be over tomorrow.

Have Mr. Gwilym Price, president of the Westinghouse Electric Co., and Mr. James B. Carey, president of the IUE, AFL-CIO, sit down at a meeting in honest negotiation.

Use the representatives of the Mediation and Conciliation Services.

Use Dr. Taylor and Mr. Cole, chosen by the governors of the States in which plants of the Westinghouse are located.

Use every honorable means available to end this disastrous strike, but by all means end it.

If this is done the men will soon be back to work.

Immediately after this speech, I am sending a copy of it to Mr. Carey and Mr. Price, with the request as the elected representative of this district, this be done at once.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, are there other special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are no further special orders for today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 2 minutes.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were two extremely serious railroad accidents in Massachusetts. In one accident 13 lives were lost and many were injured—over

a hundred cars were demolished. There was another train accident involving a so-called Budd Liner train running to Boston and 20 or more were injured. An open hearing will be held at the courthouse in Boston on March 6 at 2 o'clock, to determine why this accident occurred, the Interstate Commerce Commission informs me.

Mr. Speaker, in considering haste, in an endeavor to have faster transportation, it is time that we consider the safety element. In considering economy, it is necessary that we not economize at the expense of human life and limb. It is brutal to do otherwise.

I understand some of these cars have been recently manufactured with a view toward economy and for the purpose of employing fewer people. If more people were employed to man these trains, I am sure these accidents might not have occurred. And if stronger steel had been used in construction of the cars the damage might have been much less.

I came very near being on the Ambassador that was wrecked not far from Fort Meade last Thursday. I was 8 hours late in getting to Boston about 2 weeks ago because a freight train had been derailed just ahead of us. I have repeatedly asked that the possibility of sabotage be investigated.

These accidents are occurring too frequently and should be stopped. These railroads are public carriers furnishing public transportation and we in the Congress should see that our people are transported safely. We must keep human life above material values.

THIRTEEN ARE DEAD, 100 HURT IN 2 RAIL WRECKS—BOSTON TRAIN RAMS ANOTHER IN STORM—SURVIVORS INJURED IN SECOND CRASH

SWAMPSCOTT, Mass., February 28.—A Boston & Maine Railroad passenger train sped through 2 snow-obscured warning signals today, and knifed into the rear of another train, killing 13 persons and injuring more than a hundred.

The Boston & Maine said a Budd train passed through a yellow caution signal 1.3 miles from the halted train and ran by a red stop signal 3,200 feet from the scene of the wreck in a blinding snowstorm.

The railroad said the signals were tested after the wreck and "found to be in perfect working order," although obscured by snow and ice. The Boston & Maine said the engineer, Ernest Tourtelotte, 55, of Winchester, who died in the crash, violated operating rules. Fireman Raymond F. Jones, of Lynn, also was killed.

SECOND WRECK IS SIMILAR

A short time later, another Boston & Maine train rammed a halted train in nearby Revere, injuring 20 persons. The railroad said that mishap happened under similar circumstances.

Some of the injured were in both wrecks. Escaping from the fatal crash of the Danvers-Boston train, they boarded a Marblehead-Boston train at Swampscott station to continue on their way. It collided with an earlier train which had halted while its crew checked a signal.

The first wreck occurred in Swampscott, about 12 miles northeast of Boston. The four-car, self-propelled Danvers train struck a Portsmouth, N. H.-Boston train which had halted for a signal.

The Boston & Maine said that the train in addition to overrunning the signals, passed a flagman protecting the rear of the Portsmouth train. The statement added:

An engineer, according to the operating rules of the railroad, is required to make a full stop at any signal which is not giving him a proceed indication."

The lead car of the four-car train went under the end of a heavier stalled coach. Its steel roof and one side were ripped away.

ABOUT 1,000 ON TRAINS

The two trains carried about 1,000 passengers. Most were bound for business in Boston. Many were students attending schools in the metropolitan area.

Among the dead was Miss Ruth Bean, 33, of Salem, executive secretary of the Massachusetts League of Women Voters. Her mother, Mrs. Harold C. Bean, was the admittance nurse on duty today at the Salem Hospital and identified the body of her daughter. The young woman, a Simmons College graduate, had spent 9 years with the State Department, largely in the Orient.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered were granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, for 15 minutes on Thursday, March 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, for 1 hour on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT and to include remarks of the distinguished acting Speaker, Mr. McCormack, upon the announcement of the President.

Mr. WALTER in 2 instances; to include in 1 an editorial appearing in the Honolulu Star Bulletin, and in the other an article appearing in the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$260.

Mr. PRICE and to include an article appearing in Collier's magazine, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$340.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. SHEPARD (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD, his remarks in the House today.

Mr. ROONEY and to include a proclamation by Governor Harriman, of New York.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in five instances.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include an editorial.

Mr. GAVIN and to include a statement of Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$200.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIDNALL and to include extraneous matter.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

March 2, 1956
March 1, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 36

CONTENTS

Accounting.....19	Export-import.....25	Mining.....10,15,27
Acreage allotments....8,33	Family farms.....18	Nomination.....3
Alaska.....29	Farm credit.....22	Organization.....4
Appropriations.....5	Farm program.....1,7,13	Personnel.....11,31
Budget.....19	Fisheries.....28	Price supports.....1,18
Bureau of the Budget....21	Foreign aid.....16	Property.....30
Cargo preference.....12	Foreign trade.....9	Reclamation.....6
Conservation.....14,30	Forestry.....10,27	Reports.....20,21
Cooperatives.....24	GSA.....3	Research.....17
Cotton.....33	Hoover Commission.....4	Soil bank.....1,7
Crop insurance.....23	Lands.....27	Station wagons.....5
Disaster relief.....32	transfer.....29	Transportation.....12
Economic report.....2,26	Loans, farm.....20	Wheat.....8
Electrification.....24		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate continued debate on farm bill. House passed bill providing for Colorado River storage project. House passed General Government Matters appropriation bill for 1957. House committee recommended revision of civil Service system. Sen. Aiken inserted Asst. Secretary Peterson's Chicago speech.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 3183, the farm bill. pp. 3214, 3222
Sen. Anderson (for himself and Sen. Holland) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill. p. 3209
Sen. Young inserted a letter from Rev. Joseph Hylden opposing the soil-bank proposals. p. 3194
2. NATIONAL ECONOMY. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report submitted its report on the 1956 Economic Report of the President (S. Rept. 1606). p. 3196
3. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Franklin G. Floete to be Administrator of the General Services Administration. p. 3260
4. ORGANIZATION. Sen. Langer inserted a resolution of the Assoc. of Life Underwriters favoring legislation to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. p. 3194

HOUSE

5. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 9536, the General Government Matters appropriation bill for 1957. p. 3305
The bill includes a number of general provisions applicable to all departments and agencies. These provisions are the same as those contained in the 1956 Act except that a limit of \$1,800 has been inserted on the cost of station

wagons. The bill also includes appropriations for the management improvement fund, Budget Bureau, Council of Economic Advisers, Office of Defense Mobilization, and President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.

6. RECLAMATION. Passed H. R. 3383, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Storage project, after adopting a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the original language of the bill (p. 3304). Adopted an amendment to the committee amendment offered by Rep. Avery providing that no basic crops should be grown on reclaimed land for a period of ten years (pp. 3291, 3293). After passage of H. R. 3383, S. 500 was taken from the table, amended by substituting the language of H. R. 3383 as passed for that of S. 500, and then S. 500 was passed. p. 3205
Extension of remarks of Rep. Lipscomb opposing the Colorado River Storage project. p. A1961
7. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Springer inserted the statement of Mr. Gehlbach, of the Soil-Bank Association, urging reconsideration of the soil-bank features of the Administration's farm program to conform to the proposals of the Association. p. 3310
8. WHEAT. Rep. Hoffman reiterated his allegations concerning the denial of relief for wheat growers who grow wheat for feed or seed from acreage allotment and marketing quota penalties. p. 3263
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Dingell urged a reaffirmation and revitalization of the American trade agreements program and free trade movements. p. 3315
10. FORESTRY. Rep. Hoffman defended the Administration's policies in the Al Sarena mining case and other matters relating to forestry. p. 3278
11. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee submitted a report, "United States Civil Service Commission," recommending a reorganization of the Civil Service Commission and a new basic law regulating the Civil Service system (H. Rept. 1844). pp. 3322, D182, D183
12. TRANSPORTATION. H. Rept. 1818, by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, "recommends to the House that it vigorously oppose all efforts to change or modify the Cargo Preference Act as presently applied to Government-sponsored cargos."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Johnson, Wis., inserted a Wis. Agriculturist magazine article containing the results of an opinion poll among farmers on questions of interest to the farm population. p. A1931
Rep. Schenck inserted a constituent's letter expressing his opinions on the President's farm message and stating that "... I'd again like to register my wholehearted approval of the basic thinking of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson..." p. A1933
Rep. Bentley inserted a constituent's letter and an article he sent to the Reader's Digest magazine discussing the farm problems and stating that "the only solution to the farm problem is to bring supply in line with demand." p. A1968
14. CONSERVATION. Sen. Aiken inserted Asst. Secretary Peterson's recent address before the Nat'l Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., "Conservation--A National Need." p. A1937

span of peace from 21½ years between wars to a lifetime. Indeed, we have advanced the span of peace from 2½ days to an average of 21½ years—1918 to 1941 in Europe; 1941 to 1950 in Asia—Korea— notwithstanding. For the world, 1956—?

LEGISLATION WITH REFERENCE TO WHEAT

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country the Republicans are taking a terrific lot of criticism because of the present farm policy. The Republicans are not to blame for that situation at all. But we have been sitting here and taking it without making reply. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] who is listening so attentively, knows that. The Senate has passed a bill which would help us out on the wheat surplus and correct a part of the error which was made when the legislation was written by our Democratic opponents. That is really where the blame belongs, over on the other side. I cannot understand why that Committee on Agriculture is pigeonholing legislation which will correct that situation with reference to wheat. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] will tell us about it. He would not be disclosing any secrets if he did tell us just Democratic members are holding up remedial relief.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Bailey	Gamble	Prouty
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Rains
Blitch	Hillings	Servner
Bowler	Hoffman, Ill.	Shelley
Boykin	Kee	Staggers
Burnside	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Byrd	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Chatham	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	Mollahan	Tollefson
Derounian	Powell	Watts
Eberhart	Preston	Wharton
Fountain	Priest	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and ninety-two Members have

answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, my remarks on page A1799 of the RECORD, third paragraph, should be corrected as follows: The word "justify" should be changed to "testify." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] had 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] had 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] had been recognized for 10 minutes, and had consumed one-half minute of his time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California for 9½ minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that one of the proponents for this bill has repeatedly referred to the Colorado River Association's so-called lobbying and expenditures in opposition to the upper Colorado project. No specific charge has been made of wrongdoing. The figures are drawn from official reports filed by the association in compliance with the law passed by Congress.

Any attempt by innuendo or otherwise to prejudice the Members' minds for this bill is, in my opinion, a desperate attempt to becloud the real issues.

The Colorado River Association and its attorneys, engineers, and research specialists are employees of the State of California, the cities of southern California, and the great irrigation districts of California. They are being paid by the taxpayers and property owners of California and honorable and legally established associations whose sole aim is to protect the water rights of over 6 million people and their property rights of more than \$10 billion.

No hint of scandal has ever touched their proper and legal advocacy of the interests so vital to our State. So let's have no more of this sly type of debate.

Let's proceed to the issues.

I opposed the Dixon-Yates contract because it was a \$100 million give away to private utilities of taxpayers' funds.

I am opposed to the give away of the Hell's Canyon Dam sites to private utilities because it will deprive the people of

that area for all time to come of the benefits of cheap public power. They are giving away something that belongs to the Federal Government.

I am opposed to the upper Colorado River project for the same reason. It will also, for all practical purposes, cause the Federal Government to lose the advantage of its own dam sites.

It will lose for a hundred years the opportunity of the people of the upper basin to obtain cheap public power from federally-owned dam sites and facilities.

The proposed 6-mill-per-kilowatt contracts with the 10 private utilities in the upper basin will fasten on the consumers of that area high-priced private power rates for the foreseeable future.

The Federal Government will spend a half billion dollars for the dams, generating equipment, and transmission lines, and then turn the electricity over to the private profit-making utilities.

I know they will say that the preference right is in there, but there are very few, if any, organizations available to exercise the preference right, and there are over 6,600 miles of privately owned transmission lines. You have heard many Members of this House get up and object to transmission lines from public power dams to the load center points. The Government also pays for the transmission lines from these upper Colorado Basin dams to the private utility load center distributing points.

This bill represents the biggest giveaway of all time, a \$453 million capital investment in dams and facilities. These are owned by the Federal Government, but the resulting electricity will be given to 10 private power companies so that they can be relieved of future generating investments in this area. Remember, no power is needed there at this time. The private power companies have said that they are keeping up with the demand so this bill will give for the foreseeable future Government-generated and Government paid-for power to the utility companies at the cost that they can now produce kilowatts with coal-generating plants. The power when sold on the basis of a 6-mills contract to the private utilities will not be cheap public power, it will be high-priced private power. My friends from the Tennessee Valley and from the Grand Coulee and from the Shasta area who pride themselves on supporting cheap public power for the masses of the people, let me say to you, save your conscience on this one. This is an occasion where you are turning over millions and millions of kilowatts to private power companies to sell at profit-making private-power prices to the people of that area, and you are denying the people the right to use those facilities and those damsites for all future time to generate the cheap power that means so much to the progress of civilization in that area.

Now, let us turn to a comparison between the Hoover Dam project and the upper Colorado River Dam project. We have heard that referred to by several of the speakers. In the case of the Hoover Dam it was put in on the basis of a 50-year amortization, paying 4 percent at

first, and they reduced it after that to 3 percent interest.

The Colorado project is proposed on the basis of 100 years amortization. We had firm power contracts for 2 mills per kilowatt before we built the Hoover Dam. You have no firm contracts at all on this proposed project. You merely have tentative offers of 6 mills from the private power companies. The private power companies will not put their money on the line at 6 mills, and yet it is the 6 mills sale that you are depending upon for the feasibility—question mark—of your project.

Ninety-one percent of the power that comes from the Hoover Dam into California goes to publicly owned distributing centers and 9 percent to private. All of this—100 percent of the upper basin project's power, with the exception of 1 or 2 farm cooperatives, goes to private utilities.

The waters that are impounded in the Colorado by the dams at Hoover, Parker, and Davis are used for irrigation and domestic purposes, which is the primary use under the Colorado compact.

The waters impounded in those dams in the upper Colorado will not be diverted to irrigation except in one small instance on the Navaho project, but will be impounded for power purposes alone. The water they talk about needing can be diverted now from the river above the dam sites. These are some of the important points that I hope you will consider when you vote on this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. Urr] has told you of the legal position of the State of California seeking for clarification of the compact. I cannot go into that because time does not allow me to do so.

Now, let us look at the soil-bank proposal. The administration is asking for 40 million acres to be withdrawn and put into the soil bank with a subsidy to be paid to the farmers. A recent survey of the United States Conservation Service shows that we have 21 million acres of idle land in the United States today that with proper drainage in some instances, and in some instances with no drainage at all, but in all instances in need of fertilization and a few things like that, which would cost much less than \$100 an acre, can be brought into production. But here you are paying up to \$5,000 an acre to bring 132,000 acres of new farmland and to give additional water to some 260,000 that now are in cultivation.

The statement is made that these will not be surplus crops, but here I have every project which is in the hearings and the testimony of the United States reclamation work which shows that the following crops—small grains, dairy cows, sheep, and sugar beets are all in the category of crop allocation or in the category of crop subsidies or commodity subsidies. Believe me, those lands will be used for those purposes. They tell you that they may only use it for alfalfa, but alfalfa feeds dairy cows and it feeds sheep, and in both instances you have a subsidy problem in those categories.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here a long time. I know pretty well the trend of the House. When the legislative juggernaut engineered by the majority leader-

ship and the minority leadership gets into motion, it pretty well quashes the Members who are opposing the legislation. I have no illusions as to how this bill is going to go. But I opposed projects of this sort before that were giveaways. This is the biggest give-away of all, \$453,974,000 to build a plant to make power for private utilities. In other words, the Federal Government, the taxpayers of your State and mine, buy the cow, and the cream and milk go to the private utility companies and they water it down so that the public does not get the benefit of cheap power but pays through the nose for power generated in plants which their taxes built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. He has been my personal friend for over a third of a century. Is it not true that you were attorney general for the State of Colorado during the proceedings leading up to the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I was attorney general from 1936 to 1941, and dealt with the representatives from southern California in working out the terms and conditions of the Boulder Canyon Act as passed by this Congress in 1940.

Mr. ASPINALL. And before coming to Congress you served as State counsel for the REA?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not also a fact that this 6-mill power is all going to be bought and paid for by the people of the upper basin States?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. So if there is any complaint about the rate we are paying, we are the people who are paying for it, and it is going back to pay for this project?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say that under no circumstances is this a giveaway in any manner whatsoever. It has a preference clause. There is \$145 million in this bill for transmission lines. We have no fear but whatever the REA and every individual who has a right under the preference clause as provided in the reclamation law will get his part.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not also a fact that the water which belongs to the upper basin States, and which would go to the building of this project, is now going to waste in the Pacific Ocean, and as it passes over the turbines at Hoover Dam it is producing secondary power at approximately 1½ mills, which goes as a subsidy to southern California?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may state that the record indicates that over 200 million acre-feet of water has passed into the Pacific Ocean in the last 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to recommend the adoption of H. R. 3383, known as the upper Colorado bill. This is another forward step in the development of the Colorado River. The watershed of this river is composed of seven States, which constitute approximately one-tenth of the area of the United States.

The Colorado River development began at the turn of the century. At that time engineers and forward-looking citizens envisioned the proper development of the United States. Studies were made of the potential flood control, electrical power, and the proper application of water throughout this entire area. The Congress of the United States authorized the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to enter into a compact respecting the disposition and the apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River, August 19, 1921—Forty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 171.

The Honorable Herbert Hoover was appointed by the President of the United States as a representative of the United States of America to confer with these States and arrive at a decision. None of you need to be reminded that under the leadership of the Honorable Herbert Hoover all of the States gathered around the table and adopted the Colorado River compact. This compact envisioned the proper development of the river in all of the States gathered at this table, and it was with the hope that all of the States could work together and develop the West. I need not point out to you that all of the States believed in the future development of the western half of the United States and all cooperated with the idea this could be accomplished by the efforts of the States with assistance from the United States Government.

This legislation is only one part of the plan for the development of the Colorado River. It is to be developed according to the reclamation law. This law was first enacted in 1902. Without the reclamation law the great West could never have developed and contributed to the Nation as it has in the past 50 years. The reclamation law is not designed to provide subsidies, but, on the contrary, it provides a definite method for repayment of advances made. In this instance there will be 99-percent repayment, and the small 1 percent is allocated to flood control and wildlife.

This legislation, when approved, will cause to be generated electricity for use in an expanding and growing area. The electrical energy will be sold under the provisions of the reclamation law which includes the preference clause. There is no power policy issue in this project. The power will be sold at competitive rates, and the users of the power will contribute to the project cost.

I believe that all proper-thinking individuals are interested in the development of our natural resources. This development cannot come all at once and must

be taken in stages. This is not the first development on the Colorado River, and we who favor this legislation are somewhat preplexed at the opposition advanced against the development of this river. Why there should come such vehement opposition from those who have received the most out of this development is not understandable.

Permit me to direct your attention to the facts concerning the development of this river. When the Colorado River compact was ratified, the great State of California agreed irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and the six ratifying States at that time that the aggregate annual consumption—diversion less return to river—of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of that water apportioned to the lower basin plus one-half of the surplus. With these limitations, southern California, and particularly the city of Los Angeles and the metropolitan water district together with all other contracting bodies, agreed to the terms and conditions of the compact and entered into contracts with the United States Government to repay the cost for the construction of the Hoover Dam and many other reclamation projects, less a \$25 million subsidy for flood control.

These firm contracts were based upon the competitive steam-power rates in that area of approximately 5 or 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Those desiring the water were given contracts at 25 cents per acre-foot. Then southern California, realizing that if she paid the rate under her firm contracts she would repay in less than 50 years, insisted that development be had in the upper basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. When the Boulder Canyon project was amended, then southern California began to pay not 5 or 6 mills per kilowatt-hour but is now paying an average of 2¼ mills per kilowatt-hour. She also reduced the interest rate. It is estimated she had a complete savings far in excess of \$5 million a year. When the Boulder Canyon Project Act was approved at the insistence of all of southern California there was made available one-half million dollars a year for a 20-year period to the upper basin States for study and investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a Colorado River system for irrigation, electrical power, and for other purposes.

With the moneys made available, the Bureau of Reclamation has for many years made a complete study in the upper basin States. This study revealed the amount of water that was available and selected sites for construction of power units. The study further reflected that sufficient income could be realized from these projects to pay their own way under the reclamation law. We, in the upper basin States, have waited for years for the Bureau to finish its study, and having finished its study and made its recommendations on a sound basis, we believe we are entitled to the development not only for our own area but for the benefit of the entire United States.

Since southern California has received an advantageous position by its contracts with the United States Government and developed its area far beyond its own expectations, we are at a loss to understand why they would oppose development which they, themselves, had advocated for years until this legislation was presented. As I have heretofore pointed out, they cannot lose any water because they, themselves, enacted the legislation which limits them to 4,400,000 acre-feet and one-half of the surplus. Studies reveal the upper basin States have by the compact agreed that over a 10-year period they are bound to deliver 75 million acre-feet of water, and certainly Southern California will at all times secure its just portion thereof.

Not once in all of the years of negotiation between the upper basin States and southern California was it ever indicated that they would in any manner oppose the proper development of the river. On the contrary, they held out many glowing promises and even suggested the funds for the studies and surveys as set forth in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of June 19, 1940, Fifty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 774.

After southern California had secured their advantageous position and deserted their friends who had helped them secure this position, they set about a campaign of vilification, misrepresentations and untruths, the like of which Hollywood could never expect to equal. Many of you have reached pamphlets and literature indicating what it would cost your particular State or your particular county based upon some fantastic figure pulled out of the air without any regard to the true facts. Those who prepared this literature well know that the Reclamation Law provides for repayment, and I dare you to consult any of their literature where at any time they mentioned this fact.

Can it be that those in southern California are fearful that their advantageous position will be disturbed or if it is not disturbed that they will fail to get all of the water from this river and the electrical energy generated therefrom. When a fair division has been made, why should they object now to others developing? The only answer is that they are not satisfied with misrepresenting themselves to the other States but can only be satisfied when they have secured everything from the river of which they contribute no part of the flow.

A fair analysis of this bill will show that it is good legislation. The unfair and derogatory innuendos are not based upon fact. If you are interested in the development of the western part of the United States, and property of the entire Nation, then I hope that all of you will be fair and honest and properly consider the sources from which this opposition comes and vote for this bill.

Heretofore there has been a great deal of discussion advocated by those from southern California who say that they will be hurt by this legislation and that they are opposing it for that purpose. The first point I would like to make is

that without the aid and assistance from those of southern California, this bill would not be here today. Second, I want to point out that it was their aid and assistance that made it possible, and we in Colorado, being on the mountain top of the Continental Divide, having rivers running in every direction, have been besieged with lawsuits from States all around us from the beginning of time. In 1921 when southern California came to us with a little olive branch of peace and a white dove of love and suggested to us that we settle these difficulties, we in Colorado joined with them and came to Congress and authorized the States to get together in a compact. The President of the United States appointed Hon. Herbert Hoover as the representative from the United States.

We sat down at Santa Fe, N. Mex. and wrote the Colorado River compact. It so happened at that particular time that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and I were in law school and our teacher on water rights was a representative to this meeting; he was the representative of the State of Colorado. He sat with these people, and with the Honorable Herbert Hoover to consider the terms and conditions of this compact. It was from him that we learned of the good intentions of those of southern California and all of the upper basin States to settle our differences amicably.

Following that all of the States, with the exception of the State of Arizona, ratified this compact. Arizona apparently began to see the will of the way of those who professed to be our friends at that time and who professed to be our friends until this bill came on the floor of the House. Apparently when they looked out and saw that dove of love they called it a buzzard, because it was their failure to ratify the compact that caused southern California to come back to this Congress and pass the so-called Boulder Canyon Project Act.

I want to direct your attention to the provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, section 13 (a), which provides that before this Hoover Dam can be constructed the State of California should pass a limitation act whereby they agree that under no circumstances will they consumptively use in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River.

Now, mind you, Mr. Chairman, the State of California has not contributed and does not contribute today one drop of water to the Colorado River. Seventy-two percent of this water rises in the State of Colorado and flows down that way. With that being the situation and with the California State Legislature passing its statutes of limitation, the President of the United States proclaimed as provided in the Boulder Canyon Act how we should proceed.

Contracts were entered into for the construction of the Hoover Dam and every one of those contracts stated that it was made subject to the provisions of the compact. If there is any doubt about it I have the complete list of all the contracts that were entered into and that contain that provision.

Let us examine this a little further. In the compact provision of the upper basin States they said Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico constituted the upper basin States; that the lower basin States constituted Nevada, Arizona, and California.

At the time they wrote the compact the engineering data showed that there were approximately 17 to 20 million acre-feet annually in this river. In order to be safe they said that those in the upper basin States would be entitled in perpetuity, mind you, in perpetuity, to 7,500,000 acre-feet; that those in the lower basin States would be entitled to an equal amount.

They then put into that compact a provision which I believe is unfair but nevertheless we of the upper basin States are obligated and have a burden to deliver over a 10-year period to the lower basin States 75 million acre-feet of water.

After these contracts had been entered into with the United States Government and, incidentally, they were to pay 6 mills for the production of power—is when California came to us again with an olive branch of peace and the white dove of love and said: "We want to get away from this contract. We want you to develop it."

For over 4 years all of the States sat together and finally agreed that the Boulder Canyon project Act should be amended. I want to point out to the Members of this House that there was the time that southern California agreed that pursuant to section 2 (d) of the amended Boulder Canyon project, after 1940 a half million dollars a year was made available to the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of conducting a study to see how we could develop in the upper basin States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, at the same time the southern California group came to Congress and we joined with them and a half million dollars was made available to the upper basin States for 20 years. That act also provided for an additional half million dollars a year for 30 years for the full development of all the basin. For the first 20 years \$10 million was given to the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of making a study. It was at the suggestion of those from southern California that it was put into legislation because they recognized, as I pointed out before, that they did not have any water. None of it originated in their State. They recognized that their only right was under this compact. They recognized that we were entitled to develop it. It was with that in mind that in 1946 and 1947 the State of California was asked to comment on our development. They did comment, and with a few reservations approved and went along with the right to develop as was contemplated all the time.

The Bureau of Reclamation, as has been stated on the floor of the House

by the chairman of this committee, made a complete and fair study. From that study certain recommendations were made and in those recommendations it was found that the projects in this bill are feasible.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. And that was after a factual summary of the amount of water that is in the river and a finding of dependence upon that flow of water, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

In addition to that I might point out to you of southern California who are so visiously fighting this bill: Did it ever occur to you that by the storage of the water in the upper basins and these reservoirs we would be in a better position to continue to deliver the 75 million acre-feet over a 10-year period? Is it not insurance to you to know that stored away up the river is plenty of water to run down to Hoover Dam and to supply the municipal water to the city of Los Angeles? Do you not know that if it is there stored it is then made available to you and why should you object to us developing it?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. May I say to the gentleman that water upstream above Lee Ferry will not affect the generation of power at Hoover Dam or will not put any water on the soil of southern California. We are concerned with the availability of this water.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman that we both know that water runs downhill. It comes down the Colorado River and the only way it is going to get to Hoover Dam, the only way it is going to get to Los Angeles, is as it comes on down. If it is being used there to generate electricity, the gentleman and I know there is very little water lost when used in the generation of electricity. You and I know that in this bill we cannot, under any circumstances, go ahead and use water to the extent that southern California has. Why would you not be satisfied and let us have a little bit of the supply we get from these high mountain ravines, up and down, and then when we are finished with it, make the beneficial uses we can, pass it on to you so that you may have it? Why would you not want to join with us and get more yourself?

Mr. HOSMER. Of course, the gentleman understands fully, does he not, that not one single drop of storage upstream is needed in order to make the beneficial consumptive uses of water which the upper basin desires to use under the project proposed and inserted in this bill and that therefore—

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Just a moment. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. The only thing I can say to the gentleman is that I do not understand his mathematics nor the water

conservation that he advocates, because any person will recognize and he should know that far above, a mile high, where this water starts, it goes downstream, and if you have dams and reservoirs in which to impound it and run it through the electrical turbines, it is still in the river and will still go down to you, and it will help regulate the flow. I regret that after all these years, when we had what we thought was a fair group working with us for the proper protection of the entire West, we now run into opposition that is not understandable and that the dove of love is that of a vulture nature.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the word "expert" kicked around a bit here and perhaps it has lost its meaning. However, in that I have complete confidence in the ability of the Members to separate the wheat from the chaff, I would like to make reference to some commentary from a man, not only a water engineer but one who has dedicated his life to the study of the Colorado River. More than this, Mr. Merriell, of whom I am speaking, was one of the members of the commission which negotiated the Sante Fe compact which is often raised in these proceedings. I have thus in part only introduced my expert. He is no late comer to the Colorado controversy nor has he parlayed his knowledge of the subject into publicity. It grieves me somewhat that new Members of this body, only recently citizens of the area for which they speak with such fervor and knowledge, are constrained to sell their sudden knowledge as final in determining the merits of a matter at least as old as they in total years and far older than their personal relationship with it.

Still, recent acquaintance with a problem often leads an unsuspecting candor to emerge. My colleague from southern California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] thus, no doubt without knowing its impact, said:

It is this real invasion of water rights necessary to support a growing civilization now numbering over 6 million people which we cannot countenance. California's legal rights under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act—

And here he carefully omitted the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act and the California Self-Limitation Act—

are at the heart of California's opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project as proposed in the pending bill.

I am glad he saw fit to bare this confession, yet he knew not what he said. In the first place, this legislation requires, and allows suit if it does not obtain strict adherence to all the law of the river. This legal stipulation alone illuminates the need for recourse to vast campaigns directed not to the facts but to the persuasion of the jury. The Supreme Court has clearly held that there is no justiciable issue as between southern California and the rights of the upper basin States as regard this project. It does not improve his case to argue it with fine words and phrases. We have, of course, explained this before, just as

we have met all other arguments, but I wish to make it clear that from the very first, that is way back about the turn of the century, we have entered negotiations to protect all rights under law, not only California but the other States as well. We do not propose here to abandon a half-century of policy and every bill we have considered, including the present one, so stipulates. Justice is served in the bill, but not by assertive statement directed to preconceived positions.

But to get back to one of the truly top men on matters affecting the Colorado River, Mr. Merriell, of Colorado. In his testimony last year before our committee, he spelled out how the rights of California are served, both by the law of the river and by actions of California herself. He shows, and I invite your attention to it for the real factual meat it contains, that her interests are better served by the river law and by our plans than they are by her own actions:

STATEMENT OF F. C. MERRIELL, CHIEF ENGINEER, COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

It seems very necessary to explain to the subcommittee why upper-basin people, especially those from western Colorado, are sure they must have the storage project, in its main outlines, as quickly as it can be put to work.

During the negotiations which preceded the drafting of the 1922 compact by the Colorado River Commission, one member of that commission had a fixed determination to secure for the people of the lower basin a firm guaranty of Colorado River flow to the lower basin. Mr. Norviel, of Arizona, did not at any time desist from his determination to secure such a guaranty and he was, in the end, successful.

The primary reason upper-basin people feel they must have the storage project is to counteract the deleterious effect of that guaranty in the 1922 compact upon the upper basin. To explain that effect certain terms used in hydrology must be defined. The most commonly known tool of the practicing hydrologist is a record of flow taken at some point on any stream where it is believed it will later have value, by standard methods with as great accuracy as possible. This record, which should cover as many years as it can, is, in the West, known as historical flow and sets up for some time unit, such as days, months, or years, the actual delivery of water past the point chosen on the stream. Another quantity which also appears in this analysis, and is also highly important is not the actual flow, but the hypothetical flow that would have occurred at the time the historical flow was measured, if there had been no use of any kind by men at any place above the point of measurement. This is called the virgin, or undepleted flow, and for the solution of many legal questions in water supply it often is more important than historical flow.

All members of the Colorado River Commission were agreed shortly after sessions were started that the probable average annual virgin flow of Colorado River, in the vicinity of Lee Ferry, at which point they

decided to divide the Colorado River Basin into upper basin and lower basin, had for some years been and would continue to be, about 20 million acre-feet annually. They determined to divide at that time 15 million acre-feet evenly between the 2 basins, leaving what they conceived to be a considerable surplus for later division. In an effort to lessen the danger that was inherent in the guaranty of water to the lower basin, the commissioner for Colorado, Delph E. Carpenter, introduced in article III (d), of the compact the provision that the guaranteed amount of water should not be determined on an annual basis, but should be spread over periods of 10 years.

In the light of these facts it is essential to analyze, if that is possible, the reason for the opposition to the storage project of California water bodies, and of some of the State's Representatives in the Congress. Evidently, it is thought in California that its ability, without the storage project, to get the water allotted to the lower basin together with all the water allotted to the upper basin which that basin is not using, so far as it is present in the river, will enable California to secure and use for power much more water than as though the storage project were in existence. That this will be advantageous to California may not necessarily be true, and the history of storage and use of water in Lake Mead shows the point.

After storage was started in Lake Mead February 1, 1935, the lake was filled as quickly as possible and by summer of 1941 it was actually full. From that time until the end of 1952, Lake Mead has been operated as a full reservoir, which does not mean that there were not considerable annual variations of its content and power head, but that these were at all times the maximum possible in view of the flood-stage criteria laid down for that reservoir. This insured the maximum generation of power and a very large supply of water through 1952.

During 1953-54 the production of power was continued at about the same rate as had been possible with a full reservoir every year, in spite of the fact that the reservoir was rapidly being emptied because of the low inflow in both these years. As a result it was necessary in 1954 to cut power production by about 12 percent and on January 31, 1955, the content of Lake Mead was only 12,305,000 acre-feet, less than the reservoir had contained since it was first filled, when it passed this content in June 1937. At this level there is a decrease in power head of 34 percent of the maximum power head and perhaps 30 percent of the average power head as it has been operated for so many years. With the decrease in power head the quantity of water being released must be increased to the maximum usable at the power head available to generate constantly decreasing increments of power. The only remedy under these conditions would have been sooner to reduce the output in order to conserve power head and secure more efficient operation.

If, on the other hand, the storage project has been even partially built and were working during these years, the operation of Lake Mead would not have been greatly different during these 2 years than it had usually been and the reservoir would have been much more nearly full than it now is. If the present

prospect of a fair water year in 1955 had been added to the regulation effected by the storage project, 1955 would have been in Lake Mead a year of essentially full-reservoir operation, whereas without the storage project even a very good year must be one of several such to restore the operating conditions that were so successfully maintained from 1941 through 1952. In other words, it would appear that the most efficient operation of Lake Mead will be assured only if there is regulation of this highly erratic river in the upper basin. It is a remarkable confirmation of this idea that during the months of negotiations of the Colorado River Commission, all the commissioners from both basins many times repeated their conviction that for the successful utilization of Colorado River, reservoir regulation must sooner or later be carried out in the upper basin.

Several advantages in addition to that just explained will accrue to the lower basin. The building of reservoirs in the upper basin will much lessen, although not entirely stop, the addition of silt to the loss of capacity Lake Mead has already experienced. Silt entering Lake Mead is not all deposited in the dead-storage space which is ostensibly where it should ultimately be found. Now much of it is in the live-storage space and that will always be true. This silt will neither generate power nor irrigate land, but insofar as it is part of the flow delivered to Lake Mead under natural conditions, it is measured as water, which it certainly is not.

When reservoirs have been built in the upper basin the necessity to carry empty several million acre-feet of storage capacity for possible floods can be largely eliminated. While floods are more apt to occur in the type of country composing the lower basin, it is hardly conceivable that they will require so much flood storage as is now provided, and the level of Lake Mead can be raised with profit in power production by reason of the flood protection of the upper basin reservoirs. That this protection for a most remote possibility does not lessen its necessity, means that somewhere on the river system these protective measures must be enforced.

The effect of all the factors discussed may now be assessed in western Colorado. It must first be said that all the water produced in that State, which is 70 percent of the total yield of the river, has as its first call the delivery of two-thirds of it to meet the obligation of the guaranty at Lee Ferry. In the table that accompanies this memorandum, which starts with listing of the historical flow at Lee Ferry, it is shown how the virgin flow is derived by the addition of all the various forms of consumptive use as nearly as these can be worked out. It is then necessary to deduct the amount guaranteed the lower basin and what remains is the water available for consumptive use in the upper basin. This amount, according to the 1922 compact, should be 7,500,000 acre-feet but as shown in column 11 of the table is reduced, by low-river flow to 5,866,760 acre-feet, as an average for the period, 1950-54. It varies from a yearly negative amount of 1,806,600 acre-feet in 1934, to amounts which in 9 years of the 25 are more than the upper-basin allotment, as already stated, total in the period some 20,350,300 acre-feet. But in all the other years of the period the flow is less, by considerable amounts, than the water the upper basin is supposed to have and varies very widely from year to year.

Analysis of flow, Colorado River at Lee Ferry, 1930 to 1954, inclusive

Year	Historical flow ¹	Diversions ¹		Municipal supply ¹	Irrigation			Virgin flow ¹	Lower basin ¹	Upper basin ¹	Colorado proportion ¹
		Colorado	Utah		Acres ²	Acres per acre	Total ¹				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1930	13,070.0	22.3	65.0	10.0	1,380	1.19	1,642.0	14,809.3	7,500	7,309.3	3,757.7
1931	6,338.0	16.0	35.0	10.0	1,380	.91	1,255.8	7,704.8	7,500	204.8	106.0
1932	15,290.0	26.6	45.0	10.5	1,380	1.27	1,752.6	17,124.7	7,500	9,624.7	4,954.9
1933	9,745.0	23.6	60.5	11.0	1,380	1.04	1,435.2	11,275.3	7,500	3,776.3	1,922.8
1934	4,397.0	16.8	83.0	11.0	1,380	.82	1,131.6	5,639.4	7,500	-1,860.6	-934.9
1935	9,911.0	41.6	54.5	11.5	1,385	1.05	1,454.3	11,472.9	7,500	3,972.9	2,030.1
1936	11,970.0	73.2	52.0	11.5	1,390	1.13	1,570.7	13,677.4	7,500	6,177.4	3,170.9
1937	11,900.0	78.5	59.2	12.0	1,395	1.13	1,576.3	13,626.0	7,500	6,136.0	3,144.3
1938	15,440.0	129.3	65.8	12.0	1,400	1.28	1,792.0	17,439.1	7,500	9,939.1	5,117.6
1939	9,394.0	99.9	63.8	12.5	1,410	1.04	1,466.4	11,036.6	7,500	3,536.6	1,804.3
1940	7,082.0	92.6	65.8	13.0	1,425	.94	1,339.5	8,592.9	7,500	1,092.9	539.7
1941	16,050.0	111.6	52.9	13.5	1,440	1.31	1,886.4	18,114.4	7,500	10,601.4	5,460.3
1942	17,030.0	51.0	64.2	14.0	1,455	1.34	1,949.7	19,108.9	7,500	11,608.9	5,981.7
1943	11,260.0	115.6	69.1	14.5	1,470	1.11	1,631.7	13,090.9	7,500	5,590.9	2,867.4
1944	13,220.0	80.2	68.0	15.0	1,485	1.20	1,782.0	15,099.2	7,500	7,599.2	3,906.7
1945	11,540.0	128.4	58.2	15.5	1,500	1.13	1,995.0	13,437.1	7,500	5,937.1	3,046.6
1946	8,744.0	114.4	61.0	16.0	1,520	1.02	1,550.4	10,505.8	7,500	3,005.8	1,529.6
1947	13,510.0	101.5	69.8	16.5	1,540	1.21	1,886.4	15,561.2	7,500	8,061.2	4,145.8
1948	13,690.0	84.7	86.4	17.0	1,570	1.21	1,899.7	15,788.0	7,500	8,278.0	4,258.0
1949	14,360.0	109.1	63.3	17.5	1,600	1.22	1,952.0	16,501.9	7,500	9,001.9	4,672.6
1950	11,060.0	125.1	81.3	18.0	1,630	1.11	1,809.3	13,093.7	7,500	5,593.7	2,868.9
1951	9,830.9	185.2	82.0	18.5	1,660	1.05	1,743.0	11,859.6	7,500	4,359.6	2,230.2
1952	17,978.9	185.6	70.0	19.0	1,690	1.36	2,298.4	20,523.9	7,500	13,023.9	6,718.7
1953	8,804.6	300.3	65.0	19.5	1,710	1.02	1,744.2	10,923.6	7,500	3,423.6	1,751.0
1954	6,101.1	378.7	55.6	20.0	1,730	.90	1,557.0	8,112.4	7,500	612.4	291.0

¹ 1,000 acre-feet.
² 1,000 acres.
(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(8)=(9). (9)-(10)=(11). (11)×51.75 percent=(12).

By comparing column 12 with the tabulation of "present consumptive use," on page 7, it will appear that in 8 years out of 25 the Colorado proportion of water available for use is less than the present demand, which is bound to grow rapidly in the next few years. This is the very situation the storage project is intended to ameliorate and perhaps cure. Nothing about this use of water by the storage project is contrary to the provisions of the 1922 compact, and as a matter of fact, the Colorado River Commission, although it did not express this in the 1922 compact, had in mind at all times that some project, similar to the storage project, would be a necessity in the upper basin.

Of the water which is the upper basin allotment, Colorado is supposed to have 51.75 percent of 7,500,000 acre-feet less 50,000 acre-feet allotted to Arizona, or 3,855,375 acre-feet. In column 12 of the table shown the actual water available for consumptive use within Colorado, which averages 3,015,240 acre-feet, but in 12 years of the period the water actually available is less than the average, as shown in the following tabulation:

	Water (acre-feet)
1931	105,500
1933	1,927,800
1934	934,900
1935	2,030,100
1939	1,804,300
1940	539,700
1943	2,867,400
1946	1,529,600
1950	2,868,900
1951	2,230,200
1953	1,751,000
1954	291,000

while in only 4 years of the period is the amount of water more than the average for the period, although less than the compact allotment for Colorado.

Without the storage project the figure for the average water available has no meaning for the water that can actually be used in western Colorado is not the average but only the water actually available in each year, which as the tabulation above shows would be entirely inadequate in 5 years out of the 12 listed and would seriously hamper the raising of crops in all of these years.

It only remains to list the present uses in western Colorado with a fair evaluation of future uses, which are now rapidly developing, to show that in western Colorado necessity for the storage project is much greater than anywhere else in the upper basin, and that even present uses in western Colorado will be seriously hampered if the erratic flow of the river produces many more years of flow as low as it was in 1931, 1934, 1940, and 1954.

You may judge for yourself. The waterflow into Lake Mead has been adequate for required uses in the lower basin, yet it is now dangerously low. We propose, as this shows, to do better by them than they now do by themselves. We will thus help them achieve their own goals in spite of their own contrary efforts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dixon].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I shall address myself exclusively to this problem of surplus commodities. The gentleman from California about 15 minutes ago referred to this question.

The first question he asked was why have a soil bank and take acreages out of production and then bring in reclamation projects to put acreages into production. I would like to answer that question. The reason is simple. The soil-bank feature, especially the acreage reserve part of it, expires in 1959. It is a temporary affair, and it is fully planned by the department that production and consumption will be in balance in 3 to 5 years. That is why it is temporary.

The gentleman referred in the second place to the production of dairy products in the upper basin States saying that they would add to the surplus problem. Let me give you the most recent statistics from the Department of Agriculture concerning the amount of surplus dairy products in the hands of the CCC right now.

In 1953 we had 256,900,000 pounds of butter; in 1954, 264 million pounds. At the end of last year, 2 months ago, we had only 47 million pounds of butter; it is vanishing at a rapid rate. Now, you take your dried milk. In 1953 we had 432 million pounds; in 1954, 91 million pounds; now 3 million pounds. In other words, supply and demand are almost in balance through our new agricultural program as far as dairy products are concerned and it is reasonable to assume with the USDA that other commodities can be brought into balance in 3 to 5 years. I take as my thesis the fact that this project will not aggravate the surplus problem for the following reasons.

First, it brings in only 132,000 new acres of land.

Second, the 4 upper basin States take out of production many times more than 132,000 acres of new land every 10 years. This project will not be in full production for probably 20 to 27 years, so there will be more land coming out of production in the 4 upper basin States than would go into production. It comes out for urban development, roads, and other purposes with which you are familiar.

Third, the Bureau of the Census gives us an estimate of population by 1975, when this project comes into full production, of 228 million people. That is an increase of 40 percent. If we increase acreage by 40 percent, that would take 161 million more acres. But the Department said improved methods would make that unnecessary, that we would need possibly only 100 million acres. Improved methods of farming will offset millions of acres.

Mark you this second point. We get 20 million acres through reclaiming humid lands and bringing into production lands in nonirrigated areas. These are the lands which the opposition say we should use first. We will need all that, and more, too, and still we will be 10 million acres short. It will take 35 million acres by that time to produce the meat we need because meat consumption by that time will be 49 percent above the present. That is largely what we produce under the Colorado project.

In the fourth place, the Colorado project will reduce surpluses, not increase them. You may ask me, how do I come to that conclusion? Here is the whole story. It is assumed by the opposition that if dams on the Colorado project are not built, no land will come into production. That is a great fallacy. If these dams are not built thousands of acres of new land will come into production in the Imperial Valley and in Mexico. And that is where they really are producing the surplus commodities. That is where they are producing surplus commodities on our water right now. If you want more surpluses, just let the water run down the river. If you do not want surpluses, then let us use it in the upper basin and insure the use of it to the upper basin States. Congress has decreed that these States are the rightful owners.

My available time on the floor has come to an end. However, I am submitting the following statement as an extension of my remarks to provide

elaboration and substantiation of the position that construction of the upper Colorado project will not affect our current surplus problem.

First, the new land to be brought under cultivation is only 132,360 acres and that will not be in full production until 1975. This 132,360 acres is a far cry from the "million acres of land which the gigantic upper Colorado River project and its satellite, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would bring into production"—I quote from the release of Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Monday, January 23, 1956.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas brings in no new acres, and the Colorado only 132,000.

The Washita project in Oklahoma which we were pleased to vote out last week without an opposing vote will bring in nearly a third—41,000—as many new acres as the Colorado. The Ventura project sponsored by southern California will bring into production 12,600 acres at a cost of \$1,216 per acre and an annual pumping cost of \$50 per acre. It is in a highly developed urban area and it is worth it. Many of the reasons that make the Ventura project desirable also make the Colorado project desirable. Repayment features are the same in both projects.

Why then such a roar about the Colorado and surpluses? The reason is not surpluses. We must go deeper than surpluses. The real reason is that southern California is making a pass at the upper basin States' share of the water which the lower basin States and Congress decreed to the lower basin in the law of the river—1922.

Second, increased population will bring increased demands. Our population is growing at a staggering rate. Official reports by experts indicate that our agricultural demands by 1975 will far exceed our Nation's capacity to produce.

Population is increasing at a rate of approximately 2,800,000 each year. Assuming present rate of increase continues, the United States Census Bureau estimates the population by 1975, when the project approaches full production, at 228 million. Four other predictions place the population between 209 and 250 million. The Census Bureau estimate is an increase of 40 percent by 1975.

There are 409 million acres of cropland in the United States at the present time. If the needed increase in acreage were equal to the increase in population—41 percent—we would need 161 million more acres by 1975. Of course, this figure is high because of increasing productivity. In any case, conservative estimates indicate that we will need the equivalent of 100 million new acres. The USDA says the United States will need 40 percent more overall food production by 1975 and that one of the commodities in greatest demand will be livestock, with an increased requirement for consumption of 49.4 percent.

Byron T. Shaw of USDA testified before the House Committee on Interior Affairs that we will need 35 million new acres by 1962 to produce the forage and feed necessary to maintain the current per capita meat consumption at 156

pounds per person. Livestock is the major crop of the upper basin States. For example, livestock constitutes 70 percent of Utah's agricultural income. The best estimates as to where the new acres will come from are as follows:

Total sources of new land		Million acres
Acres offset by improved farming methods	-----	70
Acres obtained by draining and clearing land	-----	20
Total	-----	90
New acres required	-----	100
Acres short	-----	10

The Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture is my authority for saying that the four upper basin States will have more cropland go out of production every 10 years than the entire Colorado project will bring new acres into production in 30 years. This is occasioned by withdrawals for urban development, highways, airports, military reservations, erosion, and other causes.

In addition to the loss of cropland we will be facing in the United States by 1975, it has been found necessary to reduce the numbers of livestock on the national forests and public lands at an alarming rate in order to protect the watersheds which are deteriorating under heavy grazing and drought conditions.

Take, for example, the watersheds in the Heber City, Utah, area, one of the best cattle and sheep ranges in the State. The livestock people are required to remove 20 percent of their cattle and sheep this year, 20 percent next year, and 20 percent the year after, because of the serious condition of the watersheds which sustain a population of 400,000 in the valleys below.

Third, these 132,360 acres will not come into full production until about 1975 and by that time demands for food will far exceed the supply. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation's most recent report, Reclamation and the Crop Surplus Problem, says:

Responsible officials of the USDA anticipate a balance between production and consumption of agricultural commodities in 3 to 5 years.

This is the reason why the acreage reserve program is to run only to 1959. The Department of Agriculture feels that there will be no need for it after that date.

This is the answer to the opposition's question: "How can the administration on the one hand call for a decrease in acreage allotments through the soil bank and, on the other hand, ask Congress to approve the building of reclamation projects?"

The answer is "the acreage allotment of the soil bank runs only until 1959."

The acreage reserve will expire 6 years before even the Colorado storage dams are completed.

Fourth, a vote for the Colorado project is a vote to reduce surpluses. On the other hand, a vote against the Colorado is a vote to increase surpluses in the basic commodities.

The assumption is fallacious that if the Colorado project is killed the water will not be put to immediate beneficial use in agriculture. On the contrary, this bill is being opposed by a well-heeled southern California lobby chiefly for the reason that they want the water. They know that water runs down hill. They know that unless the upper basin States have the storage dams to impound floodwaters these States can never use the 7½ million acre-feet per year which Congress and even the lower basin States themselves have awarded to them. Therefore, by blocking this measure the upper basin States' share of the water is, and inevitably will be, used by the lower California State and by Mexico.

If used in the upper basin States, the water will not produce, to any appreciable extent, basic commodities that go into Government warehouses under price supports. On the contrary, if the project is not approved by Congress, and hence the water not used by the upper basin States, it will be used by the lower basin States and Mexico to produce basic commodities that are seriously in surplus and do go into the Government warehouses in large amounts.

For example, in 1945—Cotton Branch of Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture—Imperial County had 9 acres of cotton. In 1953 this county had 116,630 acres of cotton. In 1945, San Joaquin County had 317,900 acres of cotton; in 1953, 1,182,750. In 1945, all of California had only 319,000 acres of cotton; in 1953, 1,348,000.

What is more alarming to cotton producers of our country, Mexico, with no acreage restrictions, now produces one-half million bales of cotton, all with Colorado water, much of which belongs to the upper basin. California has at least 85,000 additional acres upon which she can grow cotton and other basic commodities. Mexico has many additional acres upon which she can grow cotton with the upper basin States' water on the Colorado River Delta, if upper basin water is allowed to run down to her. Upper basin States can guarantee not to raise 1 pound of cotton under the Colorado project.

This is only one reason why I say "A vote for the Colorado project is a vote to reduce surpluses."

It is important to realize that wheat production in the upper basin will be reduced by construction of the project, since dry farm wheat operations can be expected to be cut from 50 percent to 90 percent in favor of crops which are more economical when irrigation water must be purchased.

SOIL BANK HAS NO BEARING ON THE ISSUE AS NOW PLANNED

The opponents of the Colorado River have said that it is inconsistent to establish a soil bank plan and take land out of production and, on the other hand, to pass the Colorado project. How is this statement erroneous?

The acreage reserve program is to expire in 1959. It is a temporary measure. The United States Department of Agriculture plans to have supply and demand

in balance in 3 to 5 years. The Colorado project will not begin to come into any production until years after that time.

The only crop produced in the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming which is eligible for the acreage reserve program is wheat, and irrigation water will reduce wheat production.

GRAIN PRODUCED IN UPPER COLORADO BASIN DOES NOT GO UNDER PRICE SUPPORT, BUT IS FOR LOCAL FEED

In 1954, 4,561,635 bushels of corn were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount a mere 440 bushels, or 0.01 percent of the corn produced in these 4 States on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of \$723. Contrast this 440 bushels with the CCC corn inventory of 757,612,049 bushels with a support value of \$1,300,322,952. Why such a small amount placed under price support? Because corn is not produced for commercial sale in these four States, but for livestock feed. In fact, none of these four States are even in the designated "commercial corn area" for price purposes.

In 1954, 2,751,961 bushels of wheat were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount only 402,420 bushels, or 14.6 percent of the wheat produced on reclamation lands were placed under price support at a support value of \$864,609. Contrast this 402,420 bushels with the CCC wheat inventory of 888,542,189 bushels with a support value of \$2,399,042,201.

In 1954, 5,121,245 bushels of barley were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount only 62,282 bushels, or 1.2 percent of the barley produced in these States on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of \$63,708. Contrast this 62,282 bushels with the CCC barley inventory of 31,261,403 bushels with a support value of \$43,966,463.

In 1954, 2,552,944 bushels of oats were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount, an insignificant 9,286 bushels or 0.36 percent of the oats produced on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of \$7,093. Contrast this 9,286 bushels with the CCC oats inventory of 35,258,232 bushels with a support value of \$29,987,599.

Why such a small amount placed under price support? Two reasons primarily: First, little acreage is planted to wheat because irrigated land used to produce fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops bring higher returns to farmers; second, most of the wheat produced, as are the other small grains, are fed to livestock.

In 1954, 2,299 bushels of rye were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this insignificant amount only 149 bushels, or 6.5 percent of the rye produced were placed under price support at a support value of \$191. Contrast

this 149 bushels with the 3,305,906 bushels in the CCC inventory, valued at \$5,390,331.

SUMMARY

In summary, then, we have shown that the surplus issue has been distorted all out of proportion to its importance.

First, because the project brings under cultivation only 132,360 new acres. More acres will be taken out of production each decade than will be brought into production by the entire project. This is due to the many acres retired by urban growth, new highways, airports, and so forth.

Second, because these new acres will not be brought into full cultivation until 1975;

Third, that our agricultural demands by 1975 will far exceed our Nation's capacity to produce, and new acres at that time will be an unmitigated blessing.

Fourth, that far more basic commodities now in surplus will be produced if the water is permitted to run down into the lower basin than if it is consumed in the upper basin.

Fifth, that the crops produced in the upper basin States are not to any extent the basic crops that make up the Government surpluses.

Sixth, that the proposed soil bank has no bearing on the issue because the acreage reserve program of the soil bank expires in 1959, long before any acres under the Colorado can be brought into production.

Seventh, that the 20 million acres in non-irrigated sections of the United States which can be reclaimed will be needed before the Colorado project comes into production, in spite of the fact that except for special areas these acres would be limited to the few basic crops which make up the Government surplus.

The real issue is not surpluses, cost engineering, or repayment. The real issue is "Who gets the water?"

I doubt that my colleagues will deny the right of the upper basin States to use their own water and by such action make that water available to lower California and to Mexico.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this project has taken a rather curious turn. One of the speakers just a few minutes ago asked you to support the project because apparently he believes that Californians are a bunch of rascals in their position in this, and their opposition to the project on the basis it uses water of the river to which the lower basin is entitled.

Also, yesterday it was implied that I had quoted some resolutions in the Record that did not exist, from certain railway brotherhoods. The statements I put in the Record did not identify any particular national organizations. It was stated here apparently that I did state they were national organizations and telegrams were produced from them saying that they had taken no record on this.

As to the organizations to which I referred, I obtained their feelings on the matter by a letter dated March 7, 1955, from Railroad Brotherhoods, California Legislative Board, representing the Brotherhoods of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Railroad Trainmen, Conductors and Brakemen, Locomotive Engineers, Railway Clerks, Railway Carmen, Maintenance of Way Employees; Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Railroad Signalmen, Sheet Metal Workers, National Railway Employees. These are all organizations in California and I neither stated nor intended to imply they were national organizations.

Also I have here a letter from the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, the grand lodge in Detroit; another letter from the locomotive engineers out in Sacramento. These will be available if anybody wishes to look at them.

There have been imputations of unworthy motives because of southern California's natural interest in maintaining the physical availability of water to which she has a legal right by urging defeat of the upper Colorado storage scheme.

There have been descriptions of some alleged water lobby, which, by the use of the word "lobby," apparently imply that something not quite proper is afoot. Such an attack is in fact an attack on 6 million southern Californians individually who, working through their own water-supply bodies, both officially and unofficially, are seeking to protect only what is theirs. These bodies are:

First. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, composed of 68 cities including Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego.

Second. Imperial Irrigation District.

Third. Coachella Valley Irrigation District.

Fourth. Palo Verde Irrigation District.

Fifth. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Sixth. San Diego County Water Authority.

There is nothing either sinister or secret about these organizations or the men and women interested in them. Their only concern, and mine, is that southern California not become parched and her future strangled by upstream developments preventing our rightful share of Colorado River water from reaching us.

The attacks being made on us are purely diversionary tactics to take attention away from the merits of our cause and the very real and apparent defects, financial, geological, and engineering, of the upper Colorado River storage proposal.

Particularly offensive to me personally, is the obstinate refusal of project proponents to take into consideration the compound interest costs on money which would have to be borrowed to finance the project and which runs into billions of dollars.

Mention has been made of the Colorado River Association which opposes the upper Colorado scheme. Just what is it?

The Colorado River Association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of citizens from all sections of California and from 43 other States.

Acting in behalf of the Colorado River Board of California and the member agencies of that board, the association is carrying forward an educational program to inform the people of the United States of existing and proposed water and power developments on the lower Colorado River.

Members of the association are representative of business, industry, agriculture, labor, the professions, women's organizations, and numerous civic, patriotic, educational and service groups.

What is the Colorado River Board of California? This is an official California State agency. The board is composed of six members appointed by the Governor. Each member of the board represents a California water and/or power agency with established rights on the Colorado River. These are the public agencies I mentioned above, namely: Coachella Valley County Water District; Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles; Imperial Irrigation District; Palo Verde Irrigation District; San Diego County Water Authority; the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which represents 68 cities, including Long Beach, San Diego, and Los Angeles.

Under provisions of the State law which set forth the powers and duties of the Colorado River Board, it has the responsibility of safeguarding and protecting the rights and interests of the State, its agencies and citizens, in and to their contracted shares of water of the Colorado River system.

The board and the State's public agencies with rights on the river are not seeking to obtain more water from the Colorado River than California's share, but to safeguarding the share of the river's water for which California people, through their public agencies, have long-standing contracts.

There are 6 million people in southern California depending on Colorado River water. The people of this area desperately need the water they are now receiving from the Colorado River system. The 6 million people who must have this water are not asking for water to pour on arid acres in order to raise additional crop surpluses and increase the Nation's tax burden; they are not asking the Government to spend \$5 billion to further their own selfish interests; they are not clamoring for the construction of a gigantic water and power system that is at best totally unsound, both from an engineering and economic standpoint; the people of California ask none of these things.

What then is southern California asking? The millions of people in this area are asking only to be allowed to continue their use of water that they must have to carry on normal daily living. This is water to be used in homes, schools, and business. This is water for drinking, washing, and water to meet the normal demands of any giant metropolitan area.

There are twice as many people living in southern California, all of them

directly dependent upon water from the Colorado River, then in all of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming combined. In addition, only a small portion of the people in these four States could possibly benefit from the upper Colorado project, while on the other hand, everyone of the 6 million people in the Los Angeles metropolitan water district will suffer equal hardship by the projects completion.

This is a case where millions of people are asking the Government not to waste billions of dollars in order to take away water that they must have to live. This is a plea by the people of southern California for the most basic necessity of life, water.

It is difficult to imagine how Congress, mindful of the best interests of the Nation and with all of the facts so readily available, could presume to pass such a bill. There is only one answer to this type of legislation: decisive and permanent defeat.

I should just like to say that when it comes time to decide whether you are going to vote for the bill or against the bill, ask yourself this. You go back home and some constituent comes up to you and says, "Why did you vote for a bill that would cost over a billion dollars in hidden interest, according to a letter from the Department of the Interior? That is a lot of money when you add it on to the direct appropriation. When you do that, you have voted away almost \$2 billions of the taxpayers' money, only \$1 billion of which is calculated to come back. Why do you impose those additional taxes on your constituents?" What answer will you give them? What will you say when your constituents say, "Why, you voted for a project that is going to cost \$794 an acre to irrigate 160,000 acres of land up in Utah, and the whole project overall will take \$545 direct expenditure per acre." What kind of an answer are you going to give them when they ask you that question?

What kind of an answer are you going to give your constituent when he comes up to you and says, "I thought this bill had something in it for the Navahos but it has nothing substantial in it for the Navahos. Why did you vote for it?" What kind of an answer are you going to give your constituent?

He might say, "Mr. Congressman, you voted for that bill and it would require power to be sold at 6 mills for the next 100 years, but electric power was not even conceived of 100 years ago." How could you vote on getting the taxpayers' money back on a speculation as far into the future as that?

Another thing your constituent may ask you is, "Mr. Congressman, what about the developments in nuclear electricity? You voted to spend almost half a billion dollars for hydroelectric plants in a day when nuclear developments are taking place."

Those are some of the things you should think of.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred

and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Thomson].

(Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the upper Colorado River storage project now under consideration is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. These projects are essential if a large section of our country is to grow and develop to make its full contribution to our expanding national economy. It is vital to the stabilization of the livestock industry of the area. It is essential if the natural resources of this area, which have been rightfully referred to as the "treasure box" of the Nation, are to be developed.

It seems that we recognize the importance of water only when we have too much or too little. Some areas of the Nation have recently suffered from too much water. We of the intermountain West have been sympathetic to their problem as we have been to other sections with the same problem. However, our problem continues to be that of too little water. It is a problem that has continuously confronted us. This has been expensive to the Nation as a whole and a source of catastrophe to the area. In the drought year of 1934, the Federal Government purchased in the State of Wyoming 284,548 head of cattle and 584,976 head of sheep as a relief measure. At least 10 percent of these were slaughtered in the fields because they were in no condition to ship. The Department of Agriculture reports that drought assistance amounted to over \$20 million in fiscal year 1954 and over \$14 million in fiscal year 1955. In 1 year, over \$650,000 was spent in Wyoming for drought relief, primarily for hay. This was at the taxpayers' expense. Better we should be assisted in helping ourselves on a sound basis by getting at the cause of the problem.

The future of our area is directly dependent upon the availability of water through conservation. We have abundant natural resources which the Nation sorely needs. These include uranium, oil shale, oil, gas, coal, titanium, vanadium, phosphorus, iron, trona, forests, and others. Most require water for development. Even in our fondest dreams, we do not see our area as an industrial giant. We will not be taking industry away from any other section. With water, we will serve as a feeder area to supply other parts of the country with many critical raw materials and at the same time will develop as a better market for the finished products.

The number one argument of the opponents of the upper Colorado River project legislation now being considered by the House has been a contention that it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation an enormous sum. I can appreciate how this argument would cause the Representatives of the other States concern. It is an easy way to appeal to the emotional reactions of a tax-conscious electorate. The argument though is not

sound and as I shall show you, is based upon fantasy and distortion.

To establish the facts, let us examine the provisions of the bill rather than to talk about something that is not before the House. The bill before the House for consideration, H. R. 3383, authorizes a maximum expenditure of \$760 million. The cost estimate of the projects shown by the committee report is in round numbers, \$758.8 million.

Of the total cost, only \$7.4 million is not reimbursable. This is less than 1 percent of the total cost and represents that portion of the cost assigned to flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation. This is in keeping with the general policy that has been followed over the years and differs from other projects only in that there is such a small amount which is not to be reimbursed. On our other public-works projects such as river and harbors and flood control, not 1 percent but 100 percent is nonreimbursable. Certainly, neither the opponents nor the rest of the Nation can be objecting to this provision in the bill.

Of the remaining \$751.4 million, \$422.7 million are allocated to power. This entire amount will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest. Power revenues will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury after the cost and interest are paid in full.

Another \$41 million of the cost is allocated to municipal water uses. Similarly on this feature, not only will the principal be paid in full, but interest will also be paid.

The power and municipal water features encompass more than 61 percent of the total cost of the Colorado project. On this outlay, the taxpayers obviously are not expected to pay a penny.

The remaining \$287.7 million authorized is allocated to irrigation. This amount is repayable in full, in 50 years, but does not bear interest. This is in accordance with the Reclamation law, and has been standard practice for the past 54 years. The principle is sound that the irrigation costs should not be expected to pay interest. Yet it is apparently on this fact that the opponents of the upper Colorado project, the most vocal of which have had the greatest benefit from this provision, apparently base their preposterous charges that some fabulous burden of hidden interest will be placed on the Nation's taxpayers. By means of arithmetical mysteries known only to themselves, the opponents have come up with some fantastic figures. One thing is quite obvious that they have assumed expenditures not authorized in this bill to accomplish their purpose. The Members of the House will certainly not fall for this type of argument to discredit this project or the reclamation program in general. This is actually an investment for the Nation as a whole and the Treasury will reap far greater returns on its investment than any theoretical interest charge would amount to.

President Theodore Roosevelt said back in 1901 when a proposal for a reclamation law was under discussion:

The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our

country, just as settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States.

The following year, on June 17, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law the first Reclamation Act, and over fifty-odd years since, the truth of his 1901 prediction was proved over and over again.

Through multipurpose reclamation projects, the entire Nation has been enriched by specialty crops not grown elsewhere in the Nation, by the stabilizing of the agricultural economy of a large part of our Nation, by the development of water for growing cities and growing industries, by the production of hydroelectric power and in taxes paid directly into the Federal Treasury on the new wealth produced—wealth which would never have come into being without the aid of reclamation.

The sum total of these benefits—taking into consideration only the direct and obvious benefits, without regard to the multiple indirect benefits that flow into every corner of our Nation and bolster the economy—is more than 10 times the total of all money that has been invested in reclamation in this country since the beginning of the program in 1902.

As Theodore Roosevelt looked forward in 1901, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power looked back on the 53-year record of reclamation in 1955 and summed it up this way:

No Federal help or encouragement has been as attractive an investment as irrigation development, or has provided, per unit of expenditure, as great a unit of return in western regional development.

There is a clear difference between wasteful expenditure and sound investment. It is as uneconomic to pass up a sound investment as it is to spend money recklessly and wastefully.

The report of the Hoover Commission task force further stated:

The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crop, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

A folder featuring a map and with banner headline entitled "A New \$4 Billion Tax Burden Threatens You" was circulated yesterday among Members of Congress. As I have previously stated, there is no way that we can determine what mathematical mysteries were employed by the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles to develop these figures. This circular does shed some light on the situation. As shown on its face, it assumes 33 participating projects whereas this bill authorizes only 11

participating projects. Therefore, from its very inception, it is not applicable to the bill before us.

There is one other thing that appears on the face of the map which I think should be set straight. The Colorado River Association of Los Angeles in the circular states:

Costs to States are based on the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation, New York City and Washington, D. C.

The careful wording of this leaves the inference that the Tax Foundation backs up the costs shown for the individual States. This is not the fact. Tax Foundation general estimates of how the Federal tax burden is distributed among States having nothing to do with the costs of this project were applied to the southern California fantasy figures. This was then used to create the inference. The fantastic costs assumed to accomplish the distortion are solely the responsibility of the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles and its associates. I am advised that the Tax Foundation has had to send out many explanatory letters.

It would appear that these people, to arrive at these costs, have entirely disregarded the fact that 61 percent of the expenditure is reimbursed in full with interest. This only leaves \$287,700,000 in addition to the \$7,400,000 that is nonreimbursable, on which interest is not directly paid back to the Treasury. This amount is repaid in full in 50 years plus the development period. These people certainly cannot expect Congress to accept this argument when one single flood-control project that they have recently asked for and which has been allowed and is presently under construction for the benefit of the city of Los Angeles involves \$348 million of nonreimbursable Federal funds. I refer to the Los Angeles County drainage area project in southern California, which, excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir, is estimated to involve the \$348 million of nonreimbursable Federal funds. These funds are not to be repaid in 50 years; they are never to be repaid. If we were to compound the interest on the Federal money for a period of 100 years on this expenditure for the city of Los Angeles and the surrounding area alone, we could contend that it was costing the taxpayers of the Nation \$4,100,000,000. How the opposition could expect up to accept that interest on \$295 million, a \$53 million lesser amount, which is repaid in annual installments over a shorter period of time, and reach the same figure shows how preposterous their statement really is. But this money, for the benefit of southern California, is never repaid. If we were to continue compounding the interest for 200 years, a figure of \$48 billion on this project alone could be developed. It is obvious that, by such ridiculous computations, it could then be contended that this one project, for the benefit of southern California only, would eventually be responsible for the entire national debt, and, for that matter, would bankrupt the Nation. The same line of false reasoning could be de-

veloped for any flood-control project in the United States. Obviously the conclusion is not true and southern California representatives would undoubtedly be the first ones to object. Our interest in rivers and harbors improvements and in flood control are not bankrupting us, as we all know. This is because it is an investment and not an expenditure on which we get no return. A sound investment, whether an improvement of navigation facilities, in flood control, or in reclamation, builds up the national economy.

Let us now take a close look at the interest-free money allocated to the irrigation features of the Colorado River storage project. We will see why this will not create a burden on the taxpayer, but will, rather, considerably ease the taxpayers' effort.

The surest way to judge what will happen on a project which is to be constructed is to check on what has happened on similar projects which have been constructed in the past. In nearly 54 years that the reclamation law has been in effect reclamation projects in the 17 Western States have returned to the Federal Treasury in taxes on the new wealth created over 25 percent more than the total cost of all reclamation construction.

A large number of these projects are not yet completed and therefore have not yet started producing. Many others have only begun to produce. That means that the full costs of the investment have been included, but that the full productive capacity has not been included in computing the return.

When we consider typical reclamation projects that have been in full production for some time, the comparison is even more impressive. The Bureau of Reclamation made a study of 15 reclamation projects that have been in full production over a number of years. It was found that the cumulative Federal income taxes paid from 1916 to 1953 directly attributable to the new wealth created by these projects—taxes that would not have accrued if the projects had not been constructed—totaled approximately 5 times the total cost of construction of the 15 projects. Without these tax revenues the tax burden on the balance of the Nation's taxpayers would have been materially increased. The net result of reclamation has been to substantially ease the taxpayers' burden, not add to it.

The figures I have just quoted relate to all reclamation projects or to samples of typical reclamation projects. There are numerous examples where the return on the investment in tax receipts has been even more startling. The Strawberry project in Utah is in the same area and on the same sort of land as the proposed Colorado River storage project. It was built some 40 years ago at a total construction cost of \$3,348,684, of which 75 percent has now been repaid by the direct beneficiaries. The area which it serves was, prior to construction of the project, almost entirely wasteland. The tax return from that land was nil. At the present time 1 year's total of Federal, State, and local

taxes on the wealth created by this reclamation project is more than \$6 million, of which \$4,400,000 goes directly into the Federal Treasury. Thus, each year the taxpayers of the Nation get back more than the entire original investment.

The projects which are proposed to be authorized in this bill have been subjected to close scrutiny by the executive agencies and by the members of the committee. In each instance it has been determined that the benefit to the taxpayers will exceed the cost, even allowing for interest on the full investment.

We thus see that there is no basis for the charge that the projects proposed by this bill will be a drain upon the Nation's taxpayers. Over 61 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended will be repaid in full with interest. Thereafter, revenues from power and municipal water users will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury. As to the amount allocated to irrigation, the principal would be repaid to the Treasury in equal annual installments in 50 years, plus any development period authorized by law. The interest on the irrigation investment would be offset many times over by direct benefits to the taxpayers—new taxes collected alone would offset many times this theoretic charge. We have not even considered revenues to the Treasury or the benefit to the balance of the Nation from business that would be directly and indirectly generated through this development.

Since the people in the area are paying for these projects again and again by irrigation payments, by power payments, by municipal water payments and by increased Federal taxes, it should neither be expected nor required that they should pay for them again. That they do is the fact under present law. Except for the 11 Western States, the other sister States were granted full and equal status with the Original Thirteen States. In our case, this is not so. We are the so-called public land States. The Federal Government still claims a major portion of our surface. Even on the remaining lands, the Federal Government has reserved the minerals since 1920. In the State of Wyoming the Federal Government holds over 50 percent of the surface and almost 74 percent of the minerals. Under the present law, all of the revenues from the sale of public lands and 52½ percent of the proceeds from mineral leasing, including the royalties, accrue to the reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is a revolving fund which by law can be used only for reclamation. At the present time approximately 50 percent of the total annual appropriation for reclamation, including power and municipal water features, comes from the reclamation fund rather than from the general Treasury. By 1965 it is estimated that 73.2 percent of the total appropriations for reclamation will be from the reclamation fund rather than from the general Treasury.

Right today repayments from Wyoming projects and contributions by Wyoming to the reclamation fund exceed the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed for the State of Wyoming.

How can anyone argue that this is a burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation? Certainly no one expects to charge us interest on withdrawal of our own deposits from the bank.

Under the present law, and at the present rates of collection, neither principal or interest on the irrigation feature of this bill can ever cost the taxpayer of another State one red cent. This is true because during the actual period of construction, the upper basin States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico will actually contribute more money to the reclamation fund bank than the amount withdrawn for construction of the irrigation features. There can be no "hidden interest" charge on the other States when these four States are depositing more money than the interest-free money which is being withdrawn. To prove the truth of these statements, we shall refer only to contributions by the upper basin States to the reclamation fund from the sale of public land within these States and from proceeds of the Mineral Leasing Act ordinarily referred to as accretions to the fund. Total accretions to the fund for fiscal 1955 were \$33,478,656.04. Of this amount, \$23.3 million, more than two-thirds, was contributed by the upper basin States. Assuming that the annual accretions remain constant at the 1955 level, under present law, over a 19-year construction period the State of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would contribute to the reclamation fund out of their irreplaceable natural resources the sum of \$442.7 million. Not 1 cent of this money comes from the taxpayers of the Nation. The total cost of all projects authorized by this legislation allocated to irrigation is \$287.7 million. The period of construction will be as determined by the Congress in making appropriations available. The most rapid period of construction that has been assumed has been over a 19-year period. We thus see that during this 19-year period of construction, the upper basin States would contribute to the reclamation fund from these sources only the full amount of the construction costs for irrigation, plus an additional \$155 million. Even under this accelerated construction schedule, at any given year the amount that the four States had contributed to the reclamation fund from the beginning of construction would exceed the cumulative amounts necessary for the construction program. Never would it be necessary that funds for the construction of the irrigation features be taken from the general Treasury.

In this computation, we have assumed that the accretions to the reclamation fund will remain constant at the 1955 rate. This is an ultra-conservative assumption. The fact is that the contributions to the fund, and particularly from these States, have steadily increased during the past several years. If we were to assume annual contributions from these States at the rate which they contributed during the period from July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955, the annual rate of contribution would be \$26.5 mil-

lion per year. The amount contributed over the 19-year construction period would be \$503.5 million and the amount by which contributions would exceed expenditures for construction chargeable to irrigation would be \$215.8 million. It is obvious that there can be no hidden interest chargeable to the taxpayers of the Nation. All features of the construction except irrigation are repaid in full with interest. Under present law, these four upper basin States will contribute during the construction phase far more to the reclamation fund than is required for that portion of the construction chargeable to irrigation. This money is to be repaid without interest but it is a case of the four upper basin States financing their project with their own money. No one could contend that interest should be charged. There is no hidden interest. There is no burden on the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation.

Certainly there must be some sense of equity in the heart of southern California. They cannot be so unreasonable as to expect us in the upper basin States to bank their projects from our natural resources without interest and then be heard to complain that we do not pay interest on our own money.

This project is sound. It is self-liquidating. It will not be a burden on the taxpayers. It is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole. It is essential to the growth and development of the area. With the project, the area can make its full contribution to the Nation through a stabilized economy and full development and delivery of its vital natural resources.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, the site of this upper Colorado River project is often referred to as a "treasure chest." Yes, it is a treasure chest. Nature has endowed this area most generously. It contains vast deposits of mineral ores. Hydro power, coal, and uranium are abundantly available to furnish necessary power.

Water, too, is available, but only in limited quantities. The water supply is sufficient to sustain a tremendous population and industrial expansion. But, this is so only if the water is applied to its highest use, human consumptive use and industrial use.

What we decide here, today, will shape the destiny of this segment of the Nation over the next 100 years.

We can go forward and benefit this area by wisely using nature's bounty. This area is destined to produce metals, chemicals, plastics, manufactured and fabricated products. We can transform these lands into an industrial empire comparable to Pittsburgh, Detroit, or the Ruhr Valley.

Or, we can go backward. The allocating of power revenues to irrigation, artificially increases electricity prices. This precludes industrial expansion and produces uneconomic farm surpluses. Water for irrigation is its most wasteful use. This program would relegate the area to a horse and buggy economy for the next 100 years.

The Senate bill, S. 500, passed last summer, contains the minimum goal of the proponents of this bill. This discussion will be confined, in large measure, to the project as is contained in Senate bill 500.

GENERAL SCHEME

Now, let us examine the overall outline of this operation.

This bill creates a holding company known as the upper Colorado Basin fund. The basin fund would construct and finance the projects and has four general purposes:

The first and primary objective is to construct 33 irrigation projects to cost \$628 million.

The second purpose of this bill is to construct \$72 million worth of municipal waterworks.

The third objective of this bill is to rehabilitate 1,100 Navaho Indian families by the construction of a dam and irrigation works at a cost of \$212 million.

The last and final objective is to furnish a cash register to partially pay for these three dubious speculations. The financial scheme to bail out these first three objectives is to construct 5 dams, with reservoir and powerplants to generate electricity. This would cost an additional \$746 million.

The total cost of these 4 ventures is \$1,658,000,000.

COST (INITIAL AND ULTIMATE PLANS)

The present bills represent, merely, the initial phase of this proposal. There are more than 100 separate irrigation projects under study for the ultimate and comprehensive upper Colorado project. This ultimate plan would cost an additional minimum of \$1,600,000,000 for a grand total of \$3,200,000,000.

Based on a national population of 160 million people, this initial phase would cost an average of \$10 per person. The additional projects in the ultimate plan would increase the average cost to \$20 per person or \$7 million for each congressional district.

REPAYMENT PROVISIONS

How does this bill propose to repay the \$1,658,000,000 invested by the taxpayers? Repayments are allocated not on costs but on the Reclamation Bureau's estimates of ability to repay.

Six hundred and eight million dollars of allocated power costs would be repayable from power consumption with 2½ percent interest.

Seventy-two million dollars of municipal water works would be repayable by water districts with 2½ percent interest.

The remaining \$1 billion is repayable without interest, on an if and when basis out of possible power revenues, and upon the Reclamation Bureau's guesses as to repayment ability.

The payout period ranges from 50 years in the Senate bill to 120 years on one project under survey.

ANALYSIS

Now, if we analyze this project, here is what we find.

At 2½ percent the interest charges on this \$1,658,000,000 investment would be \$47 million annually, for the Federal taxpayers.

The net revenues of all the power projects is only \$22 million per year. The total repayments for both principal and interest from farmers, municipalities and the Navahos is \$7,100,000 per year.

The total repayments of \$29,100,000 for principal and interest, leaves us with an annual deficit to the taxpayers of \$17,900,000, upon interest alone. The principal obligation of \$1,658,000,000 can never be repaid.

TAX SUBSIDY

I have a letter, here, from a privately owned utility comparable in size to the Glen Canyon hydro plant, costing about \$400 million. This private utility estimates its taxes to be:

	Per year
Federal taxes.....	\$9,000,000
Local taxes.....	9,500,000
State taxes.....	4,500,000

The tax subsidy would amount to \$23 million a year on only one-quarter part of this project.

INFLATION LOSS

If and when repayments are made, what do we receive for today's loans to this project? In the past 50 years, from the year 1905 to 1955, the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from \$1 to 32 cents. If this inflationary rate continues, the repayment over a 50-year average, will be worth less than one-third of the \$1,658,000,000 invested.

NO INVESTMENT BY BENEFICIARIES

It is interesting to observe that—

First. The 6,700 farmers, who claim these benefits, invest nothing in this project.

Second. The municipalities, who want water facilities, invest nothing.

Third. The power companies who purchase power without investment in plants, invest nothing.

Fourth. The States of Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado invest nothing.

If these beneficiaries have no faith in their self-conceived project, how can they ask the people of the other 44 States to take all the risk without any of the benefits. This is truly a heads, I win and tails, you lose proposal.

WATER SUPPLY

The Federal financing of \$72 million for municipal water systems is wholly unrelated to reclamation. It constitutes an unjustifiable preference in Federal financing for one segment of the country when hundreds of thousands of municipalities lack finances for their own expansion of water distribution needs. This would constitute a private, not a public PWA project, without any of the merits of the PWA.

ELECTRIC RATES

The fiscal irresponsibility of this project is illustrated by the proposed Curacanti and Juniper power projects.

The cost of electricity sold by private taxpaying steam plants in the area is

7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The same power generated at Curacanti will cost 9.6 mills and the cost at Juniper will be 10 mills per kilowatt-hour. No one has yet tried to explain how you can profitably sell electricity at 7.3 mills when it costs 9.6 mills and 10 mills to produce.

NAVAHO PROJECT

The Navaho project is submitted by the Indian Bureau as a private relief project. The Reclamation Bureau is so dubious about it that it took great pains to disclaim responsibility for it.

Although it takes only \$240 to relocate an Indian to an industrial job, this bill would bestow \$192,000 upon each of the 1,100 Navaho families.

If this bill is passed, why should not we grant \$192,000 to each of 120,000 other Indian families, so that there will be no discrimination?

This is the revival of the WPA as a private instead of a public WPA project, without any of the merits of the WPA.

NO APPROVAL BY ENGINEERS

It is generally conceded that the United States Army engineers are the top authority on engineering and fiscal feasibility for projects of this type.

On July 3, 1951, Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army engineers, severely criticized this project, and said:

In conclusion, therefore, I am unable to concur in the recommendations in your report at this time with respect to approval of the overall plan and the immediate authorization of the initial phase proposed.

In its latest report in 1954 the United States engineers again criticized and refused to approve this project using the exact same language.

At no time, and I repeat, at no time, has the United States Army engineers, the Budget Bureau, the Reclamation Bureau, the Federal Power Commission, or the Agriculture Department, approved this complete project as contained in Senate 500.

If this House approves this project by passing this initiating bill, it must do so upon its sole responsibility as to economic, financial, and engineering feasibility.

FARM PRODUCTS WILL COMPETE WITH 48 STATES

The proponents sincerely and seriously claim that the farm expansion on 1,016,675 additional acres will not compete with other farmers. Nothing could be more fallacious.

I say 1,016,000 acres because those are the figures contained in the Senate Report 500 that is available at this desk. It is not 120,000 acres. It is 1,016,000 acres.

This country is one agricultural market. Our agricultural economy is so flexible that our farmers can shift their production, almost overnight, from cotton, to soybeans, to corn, to hogs, to poultry, to milk, or to 50 other farm products.

The sugar beets to be grown on these additional acres in Utah will compete with the cane sugar of Louisiana and with the sugar beets now grown in Utah and in a dozen other Midwest and Western States.

The excess corn, wheat, barley, and oats grown in Utah will compete with

the same products produced in 40 other States.

The cattle, hogs, sheep, and milk produced in Utah, on these lands, will compete with and lower prices for the same products in 40 other States. Mr. Chairman, this bill would have the Federal Government invest \$1,658,000,000 in a scheme which, primarily, proposes to irrigate lands owned by 6,700 farmers and 1,100 Navaho Indians. The investment averages more than \$200,000 for each of these, 7,800 families.

This investment is subsidized and inevitably the products produced must also be subsidized. In their self-interest, these farmers will seek to repay as little as possible of the allocated costs assessed to them. Due to the Federal investment, they will seek greater and greater subsidies for their produce from the Federal Government.

We are transforming these 7,800 families from farmers producing salable products into lobbyists whose prime motive is to exert political pressures for increasing governmental subsidies.

This grandiose plan destroys the capital investment of \$1,658,000,000, it wastes precious water resources, it depletes the fertile soil bank lands, it depresses all farm market prices, and it further delays the balancing of supply with market demands for farm products. The taxation of farmers, to increase farm surpluses, is adding insult to injury.

This bill is a travesty upon good commonsense.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ought to be recommitted.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

(Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the work of the gentleman who has just spoken has been outstanding in our committee. He has been very industrious. The bill before us today, however, is the House bill and not the Senate bill on which he has spent most of his time debating this afternoon. The Senate bill is not before this body. The House bill, a much more modest bill and, in my opinion, an economically feasible bill, is the one on which we are having this debate.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak for people who are not only my constituents but constituents of every Member of this House, for they are wards of the Government and they and their property are and have been under control of the Federal Government for more than a century.

New Mexico and Arizona had hardly been under the rule of the American Government a few years, when the American soldiers in 1863 under Kit Carson rounded up all the Navaho people—men, women, and children—uprooted them from the banks of the San Juan and other streams, and marched them 200 miles away to Fort Sumner. There they

were held captive in a concentration camp for 5 years. By 1868 they were dying so fast, that the military marched them back and turned them loose on a very restricted area of the poorest land ever. In the treaty those Indians were forced to sign, they promised never to leave the limited reservation assigned to them.

Except for an abortive effort to rehabilitate these Indians back in 1898, which was abandoned almost before it got started, nothing of any consequence was done for them, and they endured almost a whole century of suffering, neglect, and injustice at the hands of the people who confiscated their lands. In the thirties and forties many millions of dollars finally were expended in an effort to provide hospitals and schools, but that effort was so inadequate that in 1948 there were 14,000 Navaho children who had no schooling whatsoever.

In 1950 another effort was begun, and a bill authorized the expenditure of \$88 million in an effort to rehabilitate these Indians. That program expires in 1960. Over \$50 million has already been expended on that program. Yet Commissioner Emmons testified before the committee that it would be between a quarter and a half a century or more before this tribe could become self-sufficient, and then only if the problem is attacked from every possible angle. Commissioner Emmons said before the Senate committee:

From every point of view, I believe it is far better to invest in Navaho economic rehabilitation than in Navaho relief, in permanent stability than in the present ever worsening instability and frustration. The Navaho project offers us the best and largest opportunity of striking out in that direction.

It is unnecessary to enumerate in detail the innumerable injustices committed by us against a great people through almost a century since they were rounded up in 1863. What I have said has been only because we have a right to feel indignant when opponents of this bill refer to the benefits contemplated by this legislation for the Navahos as a huge gift, and an inordinately expensive one at that.

They are wrong on both counts. It is not a gift, but the discharge of an obligation which the Nation owes to the Navaho people. In fact we owe it to ourselves as a nation to do this at the very least, and at any cost, in honor and good conscience.

Nor is it as expensive as their propaganda tries to make it appear. The final plans and reports on which the irrigation project will be considered by Congress at the proper time will show that this will not be any more expensive acre for acre than similar irrigation elsewhere.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] the day before yesterday repeated a statement which has caused a great deal of confusion. When I asked him to yield so that we could advise him, as he had asked, whether it was true or false, he declined to yield.

What has occurred here to create the confusion is that a photostatic copy of 2 or 3 questions and answers taken out of context was sent to every Member of Congress, designed to show that a 100-

acre farm for each Navaho Indian family, would cost \$192,000.

I do not have it. But you will remember it; it was entitled "PILLION Speechless."

I was speechless at the audacity, and the unfairness of whoever was responsible for that photostatic handout.

Those questions and answers were based on a quick, off the cuff, pencil calculation by a committee member, and in good faith, I am sure. But those who distributed it knew that the conclusions asserted in their handout were as false as all the rest of the unfair, unethical, and unwarranted propaganda to which we have been subjected.

The questions and answers circulated are from page 233 of the hearings. In the same testimony at page 239 the complete cost figures were placed in the record, and clearly showed the error of the quick calculation, at page 233.

Those figures show that the \$211,845,000 upon which the pencil calculation of \$200,000 per family was made at the hearing included \$36 million for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir; it also included 29,000 acres which are to be irrigated by non-Indians; and it included nearly \$11 million for the Kutz Canyon pumping plant for non-Indian irrigation. Unwittingly, in the pencil calculation this entire total amount was charged to 110,000 acres of the Indian project, and, of course, the result was a completely erroneous and excessive figure. There are other inaccuracies which I do not have the time to enumerate, but this will suffice to illustrate the falsity and fallacy of this propaganda.

And of course, the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, as distinguished from the Navaho's irrigation project, is to serve many purposes, including the irrigation of non-Indian lands, the San Juan-Chama Transmountain Diversion, and a large amount of industrial and municipal water to be used by non-Indians, and as well to take its part in the overall purpose of providing the total storage structure to control, regulate, and distribute the waters of the entire basin. The entire cost of the dam is to be repaid to the Government from the power revenues.

In that same handout they say that because it was so expensive the Navaho irrigation project had been dropped from the bill, intimating that the Navahos will get nothing from it, when the truth of the matter is, and they know it, that the Navaho irrigation project and the south San Juan project, and the San Juan-Chama diversion project, never have been in this legislation except on a provisional authorization basis. Only the storage dam at a cost of \$36 million has been in from the start.

Then they turn around and say, quite to the contrary—they are so zealous they meet themselves coming and going—that the construction of the Navaho Dam and Reservoir commits us firmly to providing the Navaho Indians with an irrigation project. To that I say amen, it does do that. This bill does authorize the Navaho Dam, which among other things will store water for an Indian irrigation project, and when this is done we are firmly committed to provide the

irrigation project through which the waters of the dam so impounded may be used.

Legally and morally the Navaho Indians are entitled to a fair share of the waters of the San Juan River, their river, and the only one they have. We all know that if in the overall storage control and distribution of the upper Colorado Basin waters, no provision is made for storage of the Indian waters, so they may hold them and use them when and where it is feasible, we have taken their water away just as effectively as if we included in this bill a provision saying:

The waters of the Navaho Indians in the San Juan River are hereby appropriated for the mainstream of the Colorado River, and shall be permitted to flow unimpeded down the Colorado River to southern California and Mexico, for the use and benefit of those who may have the influence, the finances, and the capacity to put them to beneficial use.

I have said before, and I say now, that no Congress with any conscience is going to take these waters away from the Indians, and the only way to prevent their being taken away from the Indians is to provide the necessary storage to hold them.

Navaho families are by Government regulation allowed to pasture only 250 head of sheep per family, which barely gives them a subsistence living, if it does that. It was testified that transfer of some of those families into a farming economy, will permit an increase in the number of sheep to each family, and perhaps a better than a bare subsistence living which is now their lot.

The building of the dam itself and other irrigation works, and their operation, will provide employment for thousands of Navaho people. It was testified that the placing of 1,110 families on approximately 110,000 acres of irrigated land, would create work and provide livelihood not only for those families but for a total of 18,000 Navaho people. Many people believe that the 100-acre allotments can be cut in half, and still provide a good livelihood for twice the number of families at present contemplated.

For example the testimony is that there are now 7,669 acres farmed by 900 Navaho farm families, with about a \$300,000 income from produce. That is the record. If they can do that on an average of 8½ acres, they can do so 5 times better on 40 or 50.

Of course the Navahos do not go in and will not go in for farming on a commercial scale. The farms will provide a home and land enough to raise what they need to eat and to feed their own stock, with very little to sell and that probably only for trade among their own people.

The Navaho Reservation with a population of 70,000 Navahos, consists of 24,000 square miles of territory. In total area it approximates the combined States of Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. It is twice the combined area of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Panama Canal Zone, and the Virgin

Islands. It is rich in natural undeveloped resources. There are small areas of timber. There are large deposits of minerals such as coal and uranium. In fact it was a Navaho Indian who discovered the largest deposit of uranium yet known. The helium in the reservation has been preempted by the Government which holds a monopoly on it. These and other resources can be developed, and industry created when and if water is impounded and stored for their use within the limits of their share, and the share of New Mexico waters under the compact, to which the Navaho waters have been charged.

Notwithstanding all these lands and these resources the Navaho Indians therein will continue to live under standards which are a discredit to this Government of ours, and notwithstanding the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars in the years to come, unless the water necessary to develop their resources is impounded and put to beneficial use, and unless we continue a rehabilitation program that will make them self-sufficient and self-sustaining. Use of their waters to which they are justly entitled will be one big long step forward. I repeat that no Congress is going to take these waters away from the Indians and that unless these waters are impounded they will as effectively lose them as if they were taken away from them. I have confidence therefore that the Congress will meet these obligations irrespective of the cost involved.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I come from a portion of California that does not necessarily associate me with either southern California or northern California, since it happens that my home and my district are in almost the geographical center of that great State.

During some of the discussions that have gone on here, there has been some question in my mind as to whether or not the State of California or certain other Western States were on trial here with reference to some of the things they may have done in the past or some of their past performances with reference to the water of the Colorado River.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that considered this bill over a period of many, many weeks, I felt that we had two basic principles on which to make our determination as to whether or not we would support or oppose the legislation we have before us today. Those two basic principles, as I understood them, were with reference to the economic feasibility of this project, and whether or not the people of the upper basin States—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico—had any rights to the water of the Colorado River.

The thing that I considered with reference to this particular principle was the statement we find throughout the legislation we have before us here today, and that is, those rights which are found in section 9 of the bill, wherein the statement is made:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision—

Then we have a long list of contracts and of agreements between the State of California and the upper basin States.

I am here as a Representative from California to say that I do not desire to give away one drop of California's water, but I do believe that the upper basin States have certain rights under these compacts and that California is fully protected by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] made the statement that he did. Much has been said here in the past 2 days with regard to the water rights problem on the Colorado River. I suspect that there are not going to be any votes changed one way or the other on that particular point. But, for the benefit of my friends from southern California who have raised the question as to southern California's water rights, with particular reference to one engineering report, the Hill report, I would like to refer them to an item I put in the RECORD of yesterday, which is the last item in the Appendix, dealing with the problem. To emphasize again what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has said, that is, that section 14 of this bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall manage these water projects in accord with the basic pact on the river, the law of the river. If he does not do so, any State can go to the Supreme Court, and the consent of the Congress to join the Federal Government in that suit is already given. Any State that does not like the administration of these projects and says that the law of the river is not being complied with can simply step into the Supreme Court and get that matter adjudicated.

Some reference has been made here in this debate to the engineering on this project. For my own part, I am perfectly willing to leave that to the engineers. I do not believe that the men who built Hoover and who built Parker Dam and who built Davis Dam and who built Grand Coulee and who built Shasta Dam and who built many, many others of the great water and power projects in this country are going to build a dam that will float down the Colorado River.

Some reference too has been made to the question of public power. I want to say to you that this bill contains the standard provisions for transmission lines. It contains authorization for a basic transmission loop, and it contains standard provisions for preferences to municipalities, irrigation districts, and other public agencies.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. It contains, does it not, an authorization of approximately \$145,332,000 to take care of what the gentleman just mentioned?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. Now we have to say because of the vast area involved, it is a difficult matter to get to

these load centers, and for that reason the power has to be handled on just a little bit different basis. But as one who has consistently supported public power here in this Congress, I say that this bill does everything that we can do with regard to the maintenance of the public power system.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a very able member of our committee, spent his time here discussing the Senate bill. I know some of you may say, "Oh, well, we pass half a loaf here, and get a whole loaf sent back to us from the Senate side." I want to say to you, as I said to the Committee on Rules, with respect to Echo Park: As far as I am concerned, we will either leave Echo Park out or we will kill this legislation.

If my colleagues on the conference will stay with me, we will not budge 1 inch on this legislation. We think this is a good bill. We think it is completely adequate and we think it is a start for at least two decades for this great area, and it gets them on their way. If I have my way, as one of the conferees, I want to give the assurance that we intend to stand on the House bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, this project will not contribute to the surpluses of corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, wheat and tobacco, because only two of those, wheat and corn, are grown in any volume.

History shows that putting land under irrigation moves that land out of the production of wheat and corn.

Finally, the amount of new land added under irrigation, which is one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of the national cropland, is not a significant factor, and never can be, in relation to the farm surpluses of this country.

I repeat, the total new land brought under irrigation is only one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of the national cropland.

On the economics, the evidence is clear, and supported by the experts in the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Budget, that this project pays back 99 percent of the capital investment, with interest on the investment and power and municipal water.

The actual tax contribution from general taxes will be less than \$14 million a year and all of that will bear interest, because the contribution from the reclamation fund more than covers the amount used for irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. ENGLE asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations re-

specting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high water-line located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskaadee, Silt, and Smith Fork, San Juan Chama, Navaho: *Provided*, That (a) no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan Chama project of the Navaho participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That with reference to the San Juan Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all of line 5 down to and including the word "and" in line 9.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, just a brief explanation of the committee amendment. It strikes out language in the bill which some Members, especially our colleague the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] thought was too broad in the preamble reciting the authority under which this project is to be authorized. Therefore the language was stricken out

and the language substituted which narrowed the base of the recitation of the constitutional provisions under which projects of this character are authorized.

I say that merely by way of explanation. It is a technical amendment as are those which are offered down to the one that strikes out Echo Park—and that is one about which we have spoken in the debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the ranking minority member of the committee which has charge of this bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], read a statement, a press release, which advised us that the President wanted this bill passed. That raises in my mind a question of just how far the President went, just what he does want; and that doubt grows out of the fact that on another occasion it was charged that an administrative action by the Department of the Interior was influenced by the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, because of that false charge I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and have offered a resolution which was sent to the Clerk's desk.

This question raised by the resolution affects the dignity and the integrity of the proceedings of the House.

In September of 1955, a subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, joined in the investigation and subsequent hearings to "develop further facts and current information relative to problems of access to Government timber, including access roads; inadequate and outdated inventory data on Federal timber resources; increases in the allowable cut; revised timber sales practices to provide sales of a size and length that meet the needs of small and large operators alike; increased salvage sales of diseased and burned timber; and a reexamination of the effect of marketing area and other restrictions on Government timber sales."

Subsequent thereto, joint hearings were held by said subcommittees in Washington and other parts of the country. On November 25, 1955, at Portland, Oreg., a statement by Senator W. KERR SCOTT, chairman, Joint Committee on Federal Timber, was issued, concurred in by Congressman EARL CHUDOFF, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and made a part of the record.

That statement in part reads as follows:

The subcommittee will come to order.

We will now go into a matter that is not specifically a "timber sales policy problem."

Rather, it involves the question, or questions, of how certain agencies are following the intent of the Congress, the letter and

spirit of the laws of the land and the democratic processes that are demanded by the Constitution of the United States in respect to our forests and mineral resources.

The transcript of the hearing held by this Joint Committee in Roseburg, Oreg., on November 17, 1955, discloses that certain segments of the Department of Interior are in a hassle with an aged, disabled veteran over his rights under the mining laws of the United States Government.

There appears to be a concerted effort to hustle him off his three mining claims based on the allegation that the claims are not mineral in character.

In sharp contrast to this case, I am mindful of a considerable amount of talk in the past 18 months concerning what is known as the Al Sarena mining claims located in Jackson County, Oreg.

There are many Government records involving the Al Sarena mining claims and their background and their value, or lack of value, as mineral lands that have been cloaked in obscurity and covered with the dust of more than 15 years.

The Congress needs to know, and the people of America are entitled to know, what the facts are in connection with this case which was finally decided at the highest level of the Department of Interior.

This Senate subcommittee, and this House Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, and the Congress, would be derelict in its duty if it did not seek to determine the truth or falsity of the charges that have been made that, as a result of the high level interference in the Department of Interior, weasel-word legal opinions and questionable mineral sampling and assaying practices have been substituted for the dedicated judgment and experience of men trained in the art of determining which lands are, or are not, eligible for patent under the mineral laws of the land.

It is either true, or untrue, that the lands of the 15 Al Sarena disputed claims are mineral in character of just a site for a timber mining operation. It is the purpose of this inquiry to seek the answer to this question, and the one of just why and how the unprecedented step was taken of bypassing the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to accomplish what was accomplished.

Because of the serious nature of this inquiry, going, as it does, into the very fountain spring of the question of government by laws or government by influence and special privilege, all witnesses will be sworn before testifying.

It will be noted that the foregoing statements raise the question as to whether the patents therein referred to and granted on February 11, 1954, were granted because claimants were entitled to the patents, or whether the granting of the patents by the Secretary of the Interior came about because, among other things, they were the "result of high level interference in the Department of the Interior."

Frequently, throughout the hearings, it was charged that the granting of the patents was due not only to fraud, but because of influence and pressure put upon the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates by Government officials and officeholders at a "high" administrative level.

In January 1956, hearing were held in Washington, D. C., and, on January 10, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article in which it was stated that "a full-dress investigation of one of the biggest timber giveaways in recent years, namely, the sale of Rogue

River National Forest timber to political friends of Congressman"—of the minority party and naming him—"would be held."

This story also referred by name to another Congressman, of the majority party.

Both Congressmen by innuendo were charged with exerting influence and putting pressure upon the Department of the Interior, and further charged that because of this pressure, the patents referred to were granted.

The January 16, 1956, edition of the same publication further charged that the Department of the Interior had gone to unusual lengths to coach and shield witnesses who had been called to testify before the committee.

The January 27, 1956, issue of this publication, among other things, charged that the Secretary of the Interior had sold timber worth more than \$200,000 for around \$2,270.

This article further charged that the Secretary of the Interior—naming him—had been influenced to expedite the granting of the patents because of a note direct from the President of the United States. The article stated:

Buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter, which was picked up when the Senate subpoenaed the records of Secretary McKay.

It's a letter from a friend of President Eisenhower's addressed to him, asking that the Al Sarena section of the Rogue River National Forest be released to the McDonald family.

Across the letter in his own handwriting President Eisenhower had scribbled "Dear Doug." Then followed a personal request from Ike to Doug to see what he should do about granting the Rogue River request.

On February 3, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article which, among other things, stated that a member of the committee, naming him, "went to Arthur Pearlman, counsel of that committee"—meaning the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations—"and demanded":

"I want you to subpoena Drew Pearson."

"What for?" asked Pearlman.

"Make him come up here and answer before the House of Representatives as to where he got that information regarding Al Sarena. Make him produce that 'Dear Doug' letter which he says Eisenhower wrote to Secretary McKay. I want a subpoena issued for Pearson at once."

"Then," replied Pearlman, "we would also have to subpoena Secretary McKay."

"Oh, no, no, no," replied Congressman HOFFMAN, promptly dropping the matter.

NOTE.—HOFFMAN had first demanded that the Senate Interior Committee subpoena this writer.

On February 12, 1956, the same paper carried a story in which the writer commented as follows:

The charge was made in connection with a column on the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon in which I reported that when a letter arrived at the White House regarding the Al Sarena mining claim in Rogue River Forest, Ike had scribbled a note across the top of the letter to "Dear Doug"—meaning Secretary of the Interior Doug McKay—and suggested that he see what he could do about the matter.

The origin of this story was as follows:

Having heard reports that such a letter was found in the files of the Interior Department during the Senate probe of the Rogue River National Forest sale, I sent my assistant to see Robert Redwine, counsel of a Senate Interior subcommittee.

Redwine said he had such a letter but that he did not intend to let me see it. He indicated, among other things, that he planned to make use of it later in the year, when it would be more effective in the presidential campaign.

I then went to a Senator who is a member of the Interior Committee and suggested that any probe of the Al Sarena-Rogue River National Forest giveaway should present all the facts in an orderly manner and should not withhold any for political purposes later. He agreed and contacted Redwine.

Redwine said that he did have a letter which had been forwarded to McKay by the White House with a note addressed to "Dear Doug" scribbled across it in Ike's own handwriting, but he demurred about letting me see it and regarding the use of it.

I then went to the administrator of the Senate Interior Committee. Perhaps I was overdoing the eager beaver cub-reporter act, but having been doing that act for a good many years in Washington, it's hard to get out of the habit; and having had the first scoop on the Rogue River Forest sale over a year ago, I was juvenile enough to want to continue my batting average.

Anyway Redwine was called in and asked about the letter.

"I know why you want that letter," he bristled. "You want to show it to that guy Drew Pearson. I'm not going to let him have it."

After some further pro-ing and con-ing, continuing over several days, I finally published the report that such a "Dear Doug" letter was in the files of the Senate Interior Committee. I did not quote the text of what Ike allegedly said to "Dear Doug" since I had not seen and therefore did not know the exact text.

Following publication, the Capitol began to vibrate as if the British Navy once again was rolling barrels of tar into the Senate chamber to set fire to the place.

Every Republican on the full Interior Committee immediately turned up at a subcommittee hearing, plus crochety Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan, a member of the joint subcommittee, who demanded that I be subpoenaed. CLARE has subpoenaed me before so I was not exactly surprised by his new gyrations. Other Senators, led by GOLDWATER of Arizona, called in Redwine and wanted to know about the letter. Redwine at first stated there was such a letter.

When asked to produce it, he came back with a letter from the Interior Department acknowledging one from the White House. Obviously, it was not the "Dear Doug" letter. In brief, he did not produce. I was out on a limb and still am.

Later, he told other Senate committee staff members that he had seen such a letter and that he would swear under oath that he had seen it, but that he had searched high and low and could not find it now. He also stated that he had found his files rifled.

A check at the Sergeant at Arms office revealed the fact that Redwine had complained two weeks earlier about his files being tampered with and had asked for specially locked filing cabinets.

It was at this point that Jim Hagerty issued his White House blast.

Since I cannot produce the letter, I am now prepared to accept Hagerty's statement as being correct.

At a meeting of the committee held on January 26, 1956, the following occurred:

[Transcript of hearings, Washington, D. C., Thursday, January 26, 1956, pp 1178-1182]

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Secretary—

Under Secretary Clarence Davis was the witness—

In this morning's paper, the Washington Post and Times Herald, under the byline of Drew Pearson, appeared this statement, and I will read it to you:

"Buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter, which was picked up when the Senate subpoenaed the records of Secretary McKay.

"It's a letter from a friend of President Eisenhower's addressed to him, asking that the Al Sarena section of the Rogue River National Forest be released to the McDonald family.

"Across the letter in his own handwriting, President Eisenhower had scribbled 'Dear Doug.' Then followed a personal request from Ike to Doug to see what he could do about granting the Rogue River request."

That is the end of the quote, Mr. Secretary. Mr. DAVIS. I have none, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, inasmuch as this reporter says, and I quote, "buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter," does the counsel have this letter?

Mr. COBURN. I do not have it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Does Mr. Redwine have this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I do not.

Senator GOLDWATER. Do any of the counsel have this letter?

Mr. LENIGAN. Never have seen it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Have you ever seen this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I haven't any comments on that, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think it is very important. The honesty of the President of the United States has been impugned by this person in writing his column this morning and I think it is necessary that we get this cleared up when he speaks with evidently some authority saying "buried in the Senate Interior Committee files." Have you seen this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I have not seen the letter that is referred to there; no, sir.

The letter referred to was alleged to be a letter written before the granting of the patents.

Senator GOLDWATER. Had you ever seen a letter that the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior on in this particular case?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Can you get that letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I think so.

Senator GOLDWATER. Where is it?

Mr. REDWINE. It is downstairs.

Senator GOLDWATER. In the files?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary that we have that letter in these hearings.

Mr. Redwine of the staff then left the committee hearing room to get the letter.

Senator GOLDWATER. I do not want to delay the proceedings and when Mr. Redwine comes back with this letter, may I have permission to proceed a minute or two after seeing it? Why do you not go ahead with whatever questioning counsel might have?

Mr. Redwine being absent for the letter, the hearings then continued on another matter.

Page 1194:

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Redwine is back. I wonder if we might see the letter that he brought with him.

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chairman, Senator GOLDWATER asked me awhile ago about a letter with respect to what was in the column this morning. I said that I had not seen that letter. That is correct, I believe, Senator.

You asked me then if I had seen any letter regarding the President of the United States in respect to the Al Sarena case. I said that I had.

Note how Mr. Redwine evaded making a clear, direct answer. He had previously been asked, and I quote:

Senator GOLDWATER. Had you ever seen a letter that the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior on in this particular case?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

And Mr. Redwine then left the committee hearing room to get the letter which he said was downstairs in the files.

Senator GOLDWATER then continued:

Senator GOLDWATER. I think I included in my question, although I might not have, a letter that contained a personal note to Mr. McKay. Might we see that letter?

Mr. REDWINE. This letter, Senator, that I have here is addressed—I will hand it to you in just a minute—to a Mr. Powell. It is signed by Secretary McKay. The first paragraph reads:

"Your letter to President Eisenhower relating to the Rogue River National Forest mining claim allowance, has been referred to me for reply."

Mr. McKay then replied to it.

This letter of reply by Mr. McKay to Mr. Powell is dated January 5, 1955, after this [the Al Sarena] decision was over [made on February 11, 1954].

Senator GOLDWATER. Who is Mr. Powell?

Mr. REDWINE. I don't know, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Is there scribbled on that in the President's handwriting anything that says "Dear Doug"?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir.

Representative JONAS. Do you know whether there is in the committee files any such letter as that?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know.

Representative JONAS. Can you tell us whether you or any staff member took out of the Department of the Interior file any such letter as was referred to by Mr. Pearson in his column?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know, sir.

Representative JONAS. The inference is certainly clearly to be drawn from the column in the paper that there exists at present in the files of this committee such a letter which committee staff members obtained when they went through the file in the Department of the Interior, but you have no knowledge of any such letter or any such communication?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. JONAS, I might comment that this letter from the contents of it seems to be in opposition to the granting of these patents. The answer to Mr. Powell would lead me to believe that Mr. Powell wrote criticizing the President.

Mr. REDWINE. I didn't evaluate the letter at all, Senator.

Senator KUCHEL. It is irrelevant to your question.

Senator GOLDWATER. It is irrelevant to my question. It is astounding to me that a member of the press of this country would constantly refer to those lies and, if there are leaks in the committee staff, I think Mr. Chairman, we should investigate it.

How would Drew Pearson know of the existence of any letter unless somebody in this committee staff were telling him these things and how can he justify his statement that

was contained in his column this morning that goes to some 600 newspapers in this country, if I am not incorrectly informed, that the President of the United States had personally interceded in this case?

I made a speech on the floor the other day on this subject in which I agreed with Senator NEUBERGER on the need for freedom of the press. This man is destroying the freedom of the press.

That is all I have to comment.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this morning's statement by Mr. Pearson seems to be to the effect that the President gave support, by a notation on a letter, to the charge that the Secretary of the Interior had participated in a steal of timber, it seems to me that Mr. Pearson should be brought before the committee and we should understand or be given an opportunity to learn where he gets his information.

Page 1198:

In this situation to which the Senator has called this morning—there it is right before us and there are those charges—should we not try to learn whether or not the President did as charged by Mr. Pearson; endorse this steal? I ask that Mr. Pearson be called, put under oath, and that the Senator or the members of the committee have an opportunity to examine him as to where he got his information.

Pages 1200-1203:

Senator GOLDWATER. I can agree with much the Senator from Oregon says, but in a column that is read by millions of American people is a statement that says that the President of the United States intervened. I feel sure that had such a letter existed it would have long ago been put in these records. I think that I am perfectly within my rights in asking whether or not such a letter existed and if my comments on what I feel to be the responsibility of all reporters and the press to report accurately do not coincide with the thoughts of the Senator from Oregon, I am sorry.

I happen to be a layman, I am not a newspaperman; but I am like Will Rogers, all I know is what I read in the newspapers, and I want to feel when I read it in the papers that it is correct. I am glad we had this opportunity to clear it up because we will further clear it up on the floor of the Senate.

Representative HOFFMAN. I make a motion that Mr. Pearson be called, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that the chairman rule that he be called by the committee as a witness. I want to know who sanctioned and approved his course in charging the President of the United States of participating or giving support to a steal, alleged to be a steal, by the Secretary of the Interior.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am just going to say that I am not going to put the motion.

Representative HOFFMAN. You are not the chairman.

Senator NEUBERGER. Senator SCOTT appointed me as acting chairman when he left and on his return asked if I would continue to preside.

Representative HOFFMAN. Has the salary been turned over, together with the gavel? That may be irrelevant.

Senator SCOTT. He gets the same.

Representative HOFFMAN. You won't put the motion?

Senator NEUBERGER. Will you let me finish?

Representative HOFFMAN. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. You haven't.

Representative HOFFMAN. I don't care if you want to cover up for him.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am not covering up for him. I just want to say that Congressman CHUDOFF isn't here. Furthermore, I want to say this for the record: I truly believe in freedom of the press in our society. I believe if any newspaper, or journalist,

or radio commentator makes a misstatement that it is within the province of those about whom the misstatement was made to correct it in a public forum.

When I ran for the Senate, over 80 percent of the newspapers in my State opposed me very vigorously, extremely vigorously at times, I might add. That was their right. Naturally, I think they were mistaken, but that was their right, and I have never suggested or hinted that because of the things they said about me, many of which were unkind, and a good many of which were grossly untrue, they ought to be hailed before any committee. I think so far as I am concerned, we have already had too much hailing of members of the press before committees, and you don't happen to like a certain newspaperman, so you want to hail him up.

It may be that those of us on the other side don't like another newspaperman of different political persuasion and we might be tempted, unwisely, I think, into calling him up and subpoenaing him. As a former journalist and as a person who is devoted to freedom of the press, I think that any suggestion that we turn this investigation and study of natural resources into an inquisition of newspapermen or journalists or commentators is out of order.

Representative HOFFMAN. All right, Mr. Chairman. I am not complaining about the printing of anything especially, but this committee is supposed to be investigating this particular case where the charge is that this land—and this article this morning charged it—was given away here, although I notice he came down from \$600,000 in value of the timber to \$200,000, which is quite a shrinkage within a week, but where the charge is, and the charge has been in the previous articles all the way through, that the Secretary of the Interior participated in a timber steal—that is the way it has been characterized time and time again—if the committee is interested, and it has called many witnesses in trying to determine whether or not it was a timber steal, why logically shouldn't we call a man who professes to have evidence that it was and that they had gone to the highest level of authority to put it over?

If you want the facts, Pearson has the facts, allegedly, so why not call him?

Pages 1204-1208:

Senator GOLDWATER. * * * I don't like to see a man in this position say that in the files of this committee there is a letter from the President of the United States and I don't think the Senator from Oregon feels very happy about it, either.

Senator NEUBERGER. I think we ought to go on ahead and I don't think we ought to go off in any pursuit of the press.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, just once more, if I may. I am not criticizing the press. I have nothing against freedom of the press or freedom of speech. I use it, so certainly I couldn't be against it. But in this article the charge is that the President himself, by the note on a letter, influenced the action of the Secretary of the Interior.

Are you not interested? The whole hearing, if I understand correctly, on this Al Sarena, ever since the 25th day of November, has been to attempt to learn why the Secretary granted these patents. We have had some testimony of both sides on that now. I notice counsel shakes his head. We have. Here is a man who professes to know that the President himself asked McKay to do it. Do you want to know whether the higher level did or didn't, or do you want to forget it?

Senator GOLDWATER. Let me pursue one other thought on this. I mentioned this earlier. Ever since I have come to Congress I have been very concerned with the leaks

that go on in this building. I don't believe that any reporter would just sit down at a typewriter and dream something like this up. Possibly, Mr. HOFFMAN, we ought to suggest that we investigate our own staff to see who is leaking these things, to see who called Mr. Pearson and said, "Look, we have a letter down here that the President of the United States scribbled a note on."

Maybe we are talking, as the Senator from Oregon suggests, about the wrong side of this thing. Maybe we ought to look into our own staff and find out who is giving this information out that was completely erroneous.

Representative HOFFMAN. That was not my point. I don't care what the staff does. My point was that the chairman of the committee, Senator SCOTT, the distinguished chairman here from North Carolina, in a statement put out, said that the higher level overruled these gentlemen in the Department. We got into the highest level. We have gotten up to the top. We have gotten up to the President of the United States, and here is a newspaperman, who undoubtedly has some knowledge of what he is talking about, who says that the President in his own handwriting wrote across this letter telling the Secretary of the Interior to do that. Aren't we as a matter of fact, as a matter of proof, interested in that?

Senator GOLDWATER. We should at the same time be interested in who is putting this information out. This isn't the first instance.

Representative HOFFMAN. That is all right, but here is an issue that is squarely before this committee: Who caused this patent to be granted? Here is a man who says in this release published all over the country that he knows that a certain gentleman in the White House advised the Secretary to do it. Do you want to know who determined this thing for the Secretary, or don't you? There is a witness. There is a witness if you want him. Of course, you have the authority. You have the gavel over there.

Senator NEUBERGER. We have the testimony this morning that the Secretary absolutely knew nothing about it and had nothing to do with it; is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pardon me, but you have Mr. Pearson, who says that he knows that the other fellow—

Senator NEUBERGER. You people are so accustomed to having every single thing that appears in the press pleasing to you that what you want to do is call up anybody who prints something that you don't like. Will you let me finish?

Representative HOFFMAN. I am awfully sorry.

Senator NEUBERGER. You put a vast mass of material in the record from newspapers defending what was done. Should we ask the authors of those articles up?

Representative HOFFMAN. If you want to; I don't care.

Senator NEUBERGER. I don't believe we should enter into an inquisition or study of the press, period, whether they write something that you like or whether they write something that somebody else likes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like the grace of a minute or two. This statement was prepared before I ever say the Pearson column. It is the truth. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that when in a column of that kind there can appear scurrilous attacks upon the President of the United States, and especially a man of the high character of President Eisenhower, and it can go unchallenged that he interfered by some method or other with this thing we are talking about, we have arrived at a serious point in these United States.

Now, I said here that Secretary McKay didn't even know about this thing except very extremely casually. I know nothing

about any letter from the President of the United States. So far as I know, no such letter ever was written and I have no recollection of it, no communications with the President, not anything of the kind.

This is my decision. I will stand on it as having been my best judgment at the time. It was not interfered with by anyone except as I have told you by the letters here of Congressmen of both political parties pleading about it and that sort of thing, no other inference of any kind that I know of. I want to say that I do resent, sir, and I resent keenly, the implication that I was subjected to any pressure from the President of the United States or anyone else in connection with the opinion which was rendered in this case.

I can hardly conceive that a committee would not make an effort to inquire about a statement that their own staff had leaked a letter impugning the integrity of the President of the United States and then by-pass it on the ground of freedom of the press.

Thank you, sir.

Pages 1209-1219:

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Chairman, may I break in for just a moment. Let's see if we can take this down a little bit. Mr. Redwine, do you have charge of the files which were subpoenaed from the Department of the Interior concerning this Al Sarena matter?

Mr. REDWINE. Senator, my answer on that will have to be "yes and no." At certain times I have had; other times I have not.

Senator KUCHEL. Where are they located now?

Mr. REDWINE. Some of them in 224 and some in 2-A.

Senator KUCHEL. Have you gone over personally the files which were subpoenaed from the Department?

Mr. REDWINE. Senator, there was actually no files subpoenaed from the Department. I did not go over them when they first came to the committee. I will have to ask Mr. Coburn if I am right on this.

Mr. COBURN. That is right.

Senator KUCHEL. Let me ask Mr. Redwine now and then I will ask you, Mr. Coburn. Mr. Redwine, is it your answer that you have not gone over the files on the Al Sarena case which you obtained from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir; I have gone over them.

Senator KUCHEL. You have gone over all of them?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator KUCHEL. Have you found—I guess this will be the second time you have been asked this question—any letter which indicates any message of any kind or character from the President with respect to this matter?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir. I have answered that before.

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Coburn, let me ask you, have you gone over the records of this case as they have come to you from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. COBURN. In a rather cursory way. If you let me make a statement, I will explain it.

Senator KUCHEL. All right.

Mr. COBURN. At the request of the Chairman of the Committee made in writing to the Secretary of the Interior, these files were sent up to the committee via special messenger, I believe—I believe a lawyer from the Solicitor's department—and made available to the staff of the committee. At that time, Mr. Chambers, Ed Chambers, was on the staff and he and I looked them over cursorily and subsequently I turned them over to him. This is in the main committee office.

Senator KUCHEL. Is Mr. Chambers still a member of our staff?

Mr. COBURN. I don't know. Yes; he is.

Senator KUCHEL. Were the files delivered by a messenger from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. COBURN. That is correct, and he remained in the room all the time. He stayed with the files.

Senator KUCHEL. Then when he left did we retain the files?

Mr. COBURN. We retained certain photostatic copies, things that we wanted.

Senator KUCHEL. Did you see at any time any letter which indicated any kind of interest by the President with respect to this matter?

Mr. COBURN. The only one that I recall was the one that Mr. Redwine introduced.

Senator KUCHEL. You referred, Mr. Coburn, to this photostatic copy of the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to a man named Powell?

Mr. COBURN. I haven't seen it for a long time. I assume that is it.

Senator KUCHEL. This is the only one?

Mr. COBURN. Yes.

Senator KUCHEL. I want this letter to be placed in the record rather than try to interpret it. I think it might well be read, since it is the statement of our two counsels here that this constitutes the only time that the President's name is mentioned. This is from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 5, 1955, and it reads as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Your letter to President Eisenhower relating to the Rogue River National Forest mining claim allowance has been referred to me for reply.

"I share your concern for the preservation of the scenic grandeurs of the national parks and forests.

"The enclosed photostat from a newspaper which investigated this case, and which supported Adlai Stevenson, should clarify this matter for you.

"The decision granting this allowance to the Al Serena Mining Co. was entirely within the laws, which have been unchanged since 1876. The Secretary of the Interior is permitted no discretionary action under these laws.

"The 1876 statute provides that when minerals are discovered in paying quantities on mining claims the miner is entitled to a patent on the land, including the surface rights; and that once such minerals have been discovered the Secretary has no discretion in the matter.

"Before the Al Serena case was decided upon the legal staff of the Department made a painstaking and honest appraisal of all the facts. The decision was fully publicized several months ago through the press associations and in the major newspaper in the Pacific Northwest.

"In this Department's administration of the laws we are determined to comply with the law.

"This Department must adhere to the laws as they are written. If the laws need modernization, and in this case there appears to be that necessity, the legislative branch has the responsibility to revise them.

"I am glad to have had this opportunity to discuss this matter with you, and trust that I have reassured you that I am fully aware of my responsibility to all the citizens of this Nation.

"Sincerely yours,

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

I ask that that be made a part of the record.

Senator KUCHEL. I think it is fair to say for the two attorneys of law who are members of this staff and who have had the primary custody of the data which has come from the Department of the Interior, that the statement in this morning's newspaper is incorrect.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would like to pursue this one a little bit further. I have before me

a copy of an excerpt of Mr. Pearson's broadcast of January 21, 1956, in the course of which he spells out the name of the Oregon Democrat who wrote the letter. There must be a little bit more to this than we know. I can't imagine that any man on the air would care to quote—"the amazing thing is that this letter was written by an Oregon Democrat, Lou Wallace."

This is an interesting excerpt. I think it should be made a part of the record. I will be glad to read it. I quote:

"Capitol Hill, exclusive. The Senate Interior Committee has been nursing one of the hottest letters in Washington. They're trying to figure out what to do with it. It pertains to the famous sale of part of the Rogue River National Forest to the McDonald family, of Mobile, Ala., and why Secretary McKay went out of his way to make this amazing sale when other Secretaries of the Interior had consistently refused. The letter is from an Oregon insurance man to Eisenhower, asking that the Rogue River National Forest be sold to the McDonalds.

"Across the top of this letter Eisenhower wrote in his own handwriting: 'Dear Doug, please see what you can do about this.' Dear Doug, of course, referred to his Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay. The Senators now figure they have the answer as to why McKay acted. The amazing thing is that this letter was written by an Oregon Democrat, Lou Wallace."

I think we ought to see if there is such a letter some place. It would have a terrific bearing on this case.

Senator NEUBERGER. You mean a letter from a Democrat?

Senator GOLDWATER. No; no; the letter from the President saying "Dear Doug" or letters to that effect.

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement on behalf of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee?

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be the staff director, I want to state that as far as the letter in question is concerned, I have never seen any such letter. I want to further state that all the files, all the letters, all the correspondence, in connection with the Al Sarena case have been in the possession of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and none of the correspondence or none of the files has ever been in the possession of the chairman or the rest of the staff of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Lou Wallace be asked if he did write such a letter. As I say, this could have a tremendous bearing on this case.

Representative HOFFMAN. I had a couple of questions I wanted to ask Mr. Redwine, Mr. Chairman, if I may. They are very brief.

Senator NEUBERGER. We are going to adjourn at 4:30 today.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Redwine, who other than yourself and Mr. Coburn, and you said Mr. O'Brien—

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chambers.

Representative HOFFMAN. Who other than the three had access to these files?

Mr. REDWINE. So far as when they are in my office, only the two secretaries.

Representative HOFFMAN. Who are the secretaries?

Mr. REDWINE. Miss Hoban and Miss O'Connor.

Representative HOFFMAN. And no one else?

Mr. REDWINE. That is right.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you know whether they have any business relations with Mr. Pearson?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know. I have never seen any indication of it.

Representative HOFFMAN. What do you say, Mr. Coburn?

Mr. COBURN. Do you want me to answer your specific question?

Representative HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. COBURN. My office is wide open. It isn't even locked. It is just part of a room, except for a locked file drawer where I kept the Al Sarena files when I had them. I had a key to it. Mr. Mapes had a key to it. Mr. Mapes is a staff member. I don't think Mr. Chambers had a key to it, and I believe my secretary had a key to it.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you know whether any of these people, to ask the same question I put to Mr. Redwine, that you have known, or have you inquired to ascertain whether they gave any such information to Mr. Pearson?

Mr. COBURN. I have no reason to believe that they would give any information.

Representative HOFFMAN. I assume they won't, but he gets so much that is exclusive.

Mr. COBURN. May I make a statement on that point? We were never under any inhibition from the Department to keep these files secret. As a matter of fact, newspapermen have done down to the Department and looked through the whole file.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you mean that the newspapermen have gone through your office or that of Mr. Redwine, and gone to these files and gone through them?

Mr. COBURN. I say in the Department of the Interior.

Representative HOFFMAN. I understand the Department of the Interior gives them everything.

Mr. COBURN. The same file as there was in my office. It is the same file.

Representative HOFFMAN. But you gentlemen do not know anything about it, either one of you?

Mr. REDWINE. No.

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing quotations show that the integrity of the committee and of the House was challenged by the newspaper and by committee counsel.

There were but two questions involved in the granting of the mining patents.

The first was whether there was mineralization on the land sufficient to justify the granting of the patents.

The other was whether the decision had been brought about by influence and pressure exerted at high levels.

Communications addressed to the Department of the Interior by two Members of the House, by one Member of the other body, were directly challenged.

This challenge reflects not only upon the Members named, but upon the integrity of the House and of the Congress as a whole.

The statement published not only in the Washington paper, but in many papers throughout the country challenges the integrity of the President of the United States, of the Secretary of the Interior, and goes directly to the solution of one of the principal issues which was before the committee, that is, whether the decision was the result of influence and pressure exerted at a high level.

Upon this issue, there was no direct testimony until the publication of the article above referred to and the statement of the committee counsel.

Inasmuch as the integrity of the House, of its committee, is directly challenged, the current resolution is offered. It reads:

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a committee of three to determine whether Robert Redwine, a member of the staff of the

joint committee of the Senate and House which held hearings in Washington and elsewhere, has evidence to support the charge that he had seen a letter in the files of the Department of the Interior and of the committee, on which the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the granting of patents in the Al Sarena mining case: *Provided*, That said committee be given the usual authority to make investigations, hold hearings, and make a report of their findings; *And provided further*, That all expenses of such investigations and the holdings of such hearings, not exceeding the sum of \$1,000, shall be paid out of the funds heretofore authorized for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Chairman, overlong it has been customary for certain members of the press and certain columnists, some radio commentators, to sometimes directly, more often indirectly, challenge the integrity of the Congress as a whole, of Members of Congress, of its committees and members of its committee staff.

Overlong the Congress has been the whipping boy of certain individuals and of certain groups which make a practice of attributing unfair motives not only to individual Members of the Congress but to the Congress as a whole.

In my judgment the Congress is itself in part to blame for this continued flow of false charges reflecting upon the integrity of individual Members of congressional committees, and of the Congress itself. We have failed to challenge these repeated charges.

Here where a joint committee is investigating the charge that because of influence at high administrative levels, timber valued at from \$77 to \$600 thousand was given away, that mining patents were granted, where 1 Senator and 2 Members of the House have been publicly named as having contributed to the influence which pressurized an executive department into the granting of the patents, the committee at the close of the hearings is informed through the public press and by one of its staff members that the President of the United States has improperly attempted to influence a Cabinet Member. We have the further charge through the press purporting to come from the same staff member, Mr. Redwine, that he, Mr. Redwine, told other members of the committee that he had seen a letter such as has heretofore been referred to and that he would swear under oath that he had seen it but that he had searched high and low and could not now find the letter. This same staff member, according to the newspaper reporter, added that that he had "found his file rifled."

Mr. Chairman, if charges involving the integrity of the Congress, its committees, its staff members, are to go unchallenged, then indeed there should be no complaint from any Member of the Congress of any statements which may hereafter be made and which reflect upon the integrity of the Congress for its proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress lacks either the inclination or the courage to resent scurrilous charges, as to its own integrity, it should in my judgment have the courage and the decency, when the integrity of the President of the United

States is challenged, to sift those charges and when they are found untrue, as they will be if investigation is made, to hale the offender before the bar of the House where the Speaker may administer the proper rebuke.

The question here raised has nothing to do with the right of free speech, with the freedom of the press. The sole question is whether the Congress will without rebuke permit a committee employee, acting for and on behalf of an investigating committee, to falsely and publicly charge a President of the United States with misconduct, maladministration of his functions as President.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that there is one important angle involved in this debate relative to whether or not H. R. 3383, or the substitute bill which it is stated will be offered, shall now be enacted by this Congress which, in my judgment, has not yet been adequately discussed or clarified. It is the very important case now pending in the United States Supreme Court wherein Arizona, in 1952, brought suit against California, and joined as defendants therein, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the Imperial Irrigation District, the city of Los Angeles, the Palo Verde Irrigation District, the city of San Diego, Coachella Valley Water District, county of San Diego, and others.

In that case Arizona sought to quit title to 3,800,000 acre-feet of water involved in the Colorado River compact of 1922, which involves the compact States. During this debate, we have been informed by the proponents of this bill that recently the United States Supreme Court has made a ruling that the upper basin States are not legally interested in the legal controversy involved in the case which Arizona brought against California as noted. I have not heard the decision read in this debate.

At the heart of this case in Supreme Court is how the States involved will have the 7,500,000 acre-feet of water allotted to them each year by the 1922 Colorado River compact. It was quite logical that the upper basin States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would be fearful that this upper Colorado River project would normally be turned down by Congress if they should directly become involved in the pending suit which was filed by Arizona against California. I voted "aye" on the rule; not because I was for the bill but because I believe it important that this House have opportunity to debate this issue in all its phases.

I am sure that all of my colleagues in this great legislative body will naturally expect that we Representatives from southern California should expect to be, and will be, guided by the legal opinion of the distinguished attorney general of the State of California, Pat Brown, and by the able legal counsel of the Colorado River Association, officially representing the interests of the State of California in the Supreme Court litigation involving the rights of the State of California to any of the water rights involved in the Colorado River compact of 1922.

And since both of these recognized legal authorities on water rights advise that the enactment of either H. R. 3383 or the substitute proposed would now be premature in their legal judgment, and would vitally jeopardize the substantial water rights of the water users in the State of California, I will not undertake to set myself up as knowing as much about the pending Supreme Court case as they do. The great 23d district, which I represent during this my 10th year in this legislative body, is in the very midst of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County in the very heart of the 6 million American citizens thereabouts; in the very midst of this thickly populated area which reportedly is growing faster than any comparative area in our beloved Nation. Without adequate water the very lives of them are in jeopardy.

I have recognized this debate as so important to the State of California and to the Nation that I have been here almost constantly throughout this debate, even though both of my two committees have been sitting each day both morning and afternoon.

During my 20 years of law practice before I first came to this great legislative body 5 terms ago, I concluded that it was a wise client who followed his counsel's advice. And, when the vote comes on this bill I expect to follow the expert legal advice and opinion of the legal counsel for the State of California.

For instance, in the hearings I read from the opinion by Mr. Ely, the attorney for the special agency set up by the Legislature of the State of California to protect the State's interests, as follows:

Article III (a) of the Colorado River compact, in a single sentence, apportions from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and to the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, which it states shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist. Manifestly this one sentence must have the same meaning in both the basins to which it refers. But there is controversy over the meaning of the term "beneficial consumptive use." The question is whether it means the quantity in fact used, measured at the place of use, or whether it means the effect of that use measured in terms of stream depletion at some point hundreds of miles downstream. In this case Lee Ferry. The same question arises under the Mexican Water Treaty's so-called escape clause. This question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact and the Mexican Water Treaty is directly at issue in the present Supreme Court case. The quantity involved in this dispute, so far as the planning of the upper basin storage project is concerned, is 300,000 to 500,000 acre-feet, according to engineers' estimates. The Reclamation Bureau assumes that the measurement is to be made in terms of diversion minus return flow, measured at the place of use, with respect to California. The Boulder Canyon Project Act defines it in the latter terms, and the Mexican Water Treaty says (art. I (j)):

"'Consumptive use' means the use of water by evaporation, plant transpiration, or other manner whereby the water is consumed and does not return to its source of supply. In general, it is measured by the amount of water diverted less the part thereof which returns to the stream."

That corresponds with California's allegation of the meaning of the term in *Arizona v. California* (answer to Arizona, par. 8). Arizona denies that this definition applies to her uses (reply, par. 8), and the Reclamation Bureau, in the project before you, assumes that it does not apply to the upper basin, although the projects to be built under these bills are recognized as being subject to the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty.

Article III (a): Does the apportionment of the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum in article III (a) mean an average of that amount over a period of years, or a maximum in any one year? Manifestly, as in the interpretation of "consumptive use," the compact must be given the same interpretation in both basins.

California alleges in the pending lawsuit that the apportionment means a maximum, like a speed limit on a highway, not an average.

But if California is right, use by the upper basin in a given year of any quantity in excess of 7,500,000 acre-feet constitutes the use, to that extent, of unapportioned surplus, in competition with the appropriations of unapportioned excess or surplus waters which have been made in the lower basin, and subject to the Mexican treaty burden, which, under article III (c) of the compact, is to be supplied first out of surplus. The amount involved in this particular issue is very large. It is more than 2 million acre-feet in extreme years, and averages about a million acre-feet in the 17 years of excess use in the upper basin shown in the Bureau's study.

And since I am advised by the legal counsel of our State that California cannot accept or recognize that the Supreme Court has made a final determination of all the important issues involved between California and the States to the compact of 1922, I cannot either feel comfortable or consistent in voting for this bill and against the legal advice of the distinguished legal counsel of my native State of California. There appears to be a substantial legal question which has not been resolved but will be in the not distant period.

In other words, gentlemen, as of this moment it is my considered position, that even though I readily recognize great merit in the natural desire of the other compact States to develop this great water resource, I take the position that until or unless the Supreme Court of the United States has first finally and fully resolved the legal rights of the State of California as compared with the other States to the compact, both the upper and lower States thereto, I cannot vote for this measure which the legal counsel of the State of California advises will jeopardize the legal rights of the State of California under the Colorado River Compact of 1922. I therefore take the further position that it would be shooting in the dark, for other Members of this great legislative body to vote approval for this important legislation until the Supreme Court of the United States has made its final determination of the meaning of the compact of 1922, as relates to quantities of water to which each of these compact States is entitled to. That vital existing compact which has been acted upon and relied upon these many years by the State of California in its water policy ever since 1922.

Therefore I must of necessity vote "no"; and if a motion to recommit this bill to the committee, pending the final

decision of the Supreme Court in the premises is made, I will vote for the motion to recommit.

I not only take the position I do for the reasons already stated, but, also on account of the unanimous position, so far as I know, taken by the water users and agencies in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, which I represent.

For instance, here is a resolution of the city of Compton, opposing the upper Colorado River Basin project:

Resolution 6878

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Compton opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as provided in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryngpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Whereas the city of Compton is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryngpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than \$4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow the kinds of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Compton does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Compton in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed.

SEC. 2. That the city of Compton respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be air mailed to our Congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

Adopted this 22d day of March, 1955.

FRANK G. BUSSING,
Mayor of the City of Compton.

Attest:

MRS. CLYDE J. HARLAN,
City Clerk of the City of Compton.

And, I have here a resolution by the nationally known manufacturing city of Vernon, in my congressional district:

Resolution 1825

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Vernon opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryngpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

The City Council of the City of Vernon resolves as follows:

Whereas the city of Vernon is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryngpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than \$4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes, if authorized, would furnish water to grow the kind of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

SECTION 1. That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Vernon in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed.

SEC. 2. That the city of Vernon respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

SEC. 3. The city clerk of the city of Vernon shall certify to the passage of this resolution and thereupon and thereafter the same shall be in full force and effect.

Adopted and approved this 19th day of April 1955.

R. J. FURLONG,
Mayor, City of Vernon.

Attest:

G. A. ANDERSON,
City Clerk.

Also as typical of many similar ones received, I have here a telegram from one of the most distinguished of California citizens, and a resident of my district, reading as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., February 29, 1956.
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As a director of the governing boards of the Central Basin Municipal Water District and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California I am of course strongly opposed to upper Colorado River project bill and am convinced it should be defeated. We note you voted for rule to bring bill up for debate. We hope this does not indicate that you favor bill itself and earnestly ask you to vote against bill and do all possible to defeat it.

MILO DELLMANN.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "and for the improvement of navigation."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before wandering into other pursuits I obtained a college degree in engineering, and in the course of securing same, I studied quite a bit of geology. One summer during my undergraduate days I worked with a scientific expedition on the Navajo reservation in Arizona and New Mexico, and in that summer I obtained quite a bit of close personal familiarity with the geology and the economics of that particular

area. Now, I knew quite a bit about Chinle shale long before most of the gentlemen who have been talking about it here ever heard of it. In fact, I had a good bit of it ground into my hide during the course of that summer.

As a part of that work I rowed a small collapsible rowboat down the San Juan and Colorado Rivers from a point a few miles below Mexican Hat to Lee Ferry, Arizona—a distance of about 150 miles.

I make these prefatory remarks merely to indicate my familiarity with the subject. And, while I am reluctant to take up the time of the Committee this late in the debate, I think that there are a few things that are pertinent to this discussion which have not been said. For one thing there is a great quantity of silt presently flowing down the Colorado River and piling up behind Hoover Dam. At the time of the completion of the Hoover Dam, the engineers estimated, I believe, that in 75 years if something were not done to stop that flow, Lake Mead would be completely filled up and Hoover Dam would become useless. A great part of that silt, something over half of it, I believe, comes from the Navajo Reservation. The primary reason for that dates back to the 1870's when Kit Carson rounded up the Navajo Indians and took them out to Texas as a punitive measure: and then subsequently after 5 or 6 years, returned them to the Navajo Reservation.

At the time of their return they were given sheep and goats to use as their chief source of livelihood, to substitute for the hunting and raiding type of economy that had supported them previously. These sheep and goats very quickly overgrazed the reservation. Within 10 or 15 years an area which had, in part, been an area of considerable moisture, with natural lakes, trees other types of vegetation, was turned into a denuded barren desert. The denuding of vegetation produced a very rapid runoff of the water, reaching as high as 98 percent in many areas so that with every rain came flash floods which quickly washed out the natural dams which had created the lakes, and provided natural water conservation. Now, every time it rains floods result and silt in great quantities washes into the San Juan River—principally—and through the San Juan into the Colorado. Erection of some kind of works to stop this flow of silt is absolutely essential to keep Hoover Dam from eventually becoming worthless; making it impossible, I might add, for southern California to get the water from it which they now are so dependent upon. But to do this effectively not only the Navaho and Glen Canyon Dams are needed but also an effective program of soil conservation on the Navaho Reservation. But before any such program can be at all effective, the Navaho Indians have to be converted from a nomadic, pastoral people dependant upon sheep. Some other means for their earning their livelihood must be found. These dams will provide that means. It will take them out of their present grazing economy, upon which most of them depend for their means of support now, and put them into industrial work,

mining, truck farming, and things of that sort.

There is a great deal of coal on the reservation, also a great deal of uranium ores and if power is available, a lot of the present natural resources will be exploited.

But there is one other matter I would like to discuss and that is the matter of the effect of this project on crop surpluses. I believe a number of my colleagues, particularly from the Midwest, are fearful lest the land that is irrigated by this project will somehow or other come in competition with the lands in the Midwest where we already have serious crop surpluses.

I should like to point out that a good bit of this land which will receive additional water or be placed under irrigation for the first time by this project, is already cultivated by dry land farming methods and the principal crop is wheat. Once it is irrigated, it will no longer be used for wheat. They could not possibly support the cost of irrigated land through wheat production. The main thing produced will be vegetables and fruits and things of that sort which are not in competition with crops that are now in surplus. To reassure doubtful members on this point an amendment is to be offered, as I understand it, which would absolutely prohibit the use of any of this irrigated land for the production of crops in surplus for a period of years. So that, rather than adding to the crop surpluses this will cut the crop surpluses. The experience in the Columbia basin was that wheat production within the project area was cut in half.

Furthermore, I might say to my friends from the South that this water which California is so eager to hang onto, in many instances goes to irrigated land in California which grows cotton, and I am sure that we have enough of surplus cotton already. No cotton could be grown in the high and cool lands of the Colorado plateau. For these reasons I feel that the upper Colorado project has value to the country as a whole, as well as to the States directly affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate the subject of uranium was brought into the debate by one of the gentlemen from the upper-basin States.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the past 10 years, I think I know something about that particular situation. I am proud to say that we are getting a lot of uranium from the Colorado Plateau and also from Utah. This is one of the great national safeguards for the continuance of the supply of uranium ore, but this ore is coming in without the benefit of the upper Colorado River basin project. The mining of the ore does not require a great deal of water. It is being mined at this time and placed in great stockpiles at the processing centers. There has been no appearance before our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy asking that this Colorado River basin bill be passed in order to obtain more ore from the Colorado Plateau.

I do not want to be visionary, and I have always been conservative on this subject of when we will get atomic power, but I want to give you some other people's testimony on this to back up my remarks.

Mr. Francis K. McCune, vice president and general manager of General Electric's atomic products division, had this to say in GE's progress report for May 24, 1954:

Privately financed atomic plants will compete successfully with conventional power plants in 5 to 10 years.

He repeated this forecast in the July 12, 1954 issue of the *Electric World*. He discussed the feasibility and power cost of a 300,000 kilowatt boiling water reactor of a type suitable for one of our atomic facilities such as Hanford. Mr. McCune added that this boiling water type of reactor, which is a technical thing that I shall not go into, was one of the best suited for earliest and most effective competition with conventional fuel plants.

He estimated that where the coal plant production costs per kilowatt would be ordinarily about 6.90 mills, this boiling water reactor will produce power at about 6.70 mills, which is somewhat lower than steam.

This is the vice president of General Electric, whose business it is to make these reactors.

In 1954, Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, director of AEC's Division of Reactor Development, speaking before the Atomic Industrial Forum conference, urged the private companies to get moving on nuclear power, indicating that within 10 years economically priced atomic electric energy could be created. In April 1955, Dr. Hafstad's successor, Dr. Kenneth Davis, addressing the same group, stated that a thermo-nuclear power station built in 10 to 15 years will be as good as the best steam plant constructed today, and he estimated an installed kilowatt cost of between \$125 and \$140.

As to these tremendously expensive dams and generating plants in the upper Colorado basin, it has been estimated by people who have testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the installed kilowatt cost of generating plants will be from \$200 to \$705 capital investment, so you are getting a plant which is to the best of our knowledge and to the best of scientific knowledge an old-fashioned plant at a cost much higher than the present coal steam generating type of plant, which will cost about \$150 per kilowatt capacity. The record of building cost right now at the Joppa plant down at the TVA is \$190. I speak of the generating plant for the Atomic Energy facility at Joppa, Ill. Just across the river is a comparative plant that was built for \$145. That is the present cost. You are talking, therefore, about electrical costs, which run from more, to as much as 3½ times as much as a regular coal generating plant would cost.

Remember, there are great coal deposits in the upper basin of the Colorado which are now being used to produce kilowatts at about 6 mills and which as generating plant's efficiency increases it

will cost less. So what we are doing here is tying up a half a billion dollars in these hydroelectric generating plants on the river at a cost per kilowatt much more than it would cost to make kilowatts from uranium.

Long before these expensive projects are built cheap atomic power will be a reality. Long before these dams are built their justification will be much less than even the opponents of the bill can visualize.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, representing a district and residing in a State far removed from the Colorado River Basin, I hope I may be forgiven for asking two questions, I think are important, at least to my constituents and to me and, perhaps, to some others who are similarly situated. I realize that the President on yesterday made substantially this statement:

There was one feature of it—

Referring to this proposal, as I understand it—

that was originally controversial because of the belief on the part of some conservationists we would destroy wildlife in one section of the area. That dam, Echo Park Dam, has been eliminated.

It is my understanding that this provision remains in the bill as it passed the other body, but it is also my understanding that it has been eliminated in the bill that has been reported by our committee. I would like to ask the ranking member of the committee, if I am correct in that understanding?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The bill that was reported out of the committee, the new version, took out that provision unanimously. I think there is a tacit understanding on the part of the members who are likely to be the conferees that it will stay out of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. That was my next question. Then those who will be the conferees will stand by the House version.

So that there may be no question in the minds of my constituents who are concerned about it, may I address the same question and receive this double assurance. Am I correct in understanding that the Echo Dam feature is out of the bill, as recommended by your committee and that the conferees, so far as the chairman can guarantee it to us, and I realize that it cannot be an absolute guaranty, will stand by the version as recommended by the committee eliminating that feature?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is correct. In addition there is an informal agreement with the Members of the Senate that Echo Park will stay out of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have made an effort to appraise all of the evidence and the contentions one way and another, the charges and countercharges and the whole case as I see it. I am satisfied on that basis that the clear weight of the evidence is in favor

of this proposal, and I intend to support it. If I needed anything more, it would be what was said yesterday by the President of the United States when he stated, "I have more than once expressed my conviction before, that I believe that water is rapidly becoming our most valuable natural resource, and here is an opportunity, at last, to treat this whole great mighty Colorado River as a single entity, to treat it on a basin basis instead of merely a local and individual basis. We should bet busy and get on to it." Then, in conclusion, he emphasized, "So again I hope that we can have positive action on that as rapidly as possible."

In my judgment, those of us who come from other parts of the country, who may not be benefited immediately or directly by the passage of this legislation, can well resolve any doubts in terms of the recommendations that have been made by the majority of the committee in the House and the emphatic endorsement which has been repeated as recently as yesterday, by the President of the United States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct about three inquiries to the chairman of this committee and to the ranking member as well. Like the gentleman who just preceded me, the district I represent will not be benefitted directly by reason of the approval of this legislation. Nevertheless, as I said before, there are about three questions that I think are important in connection with the approval or disapproval of this proposed legislation. Since this legislation will cost a considerable amount of money, I would like to be informed whether any of the funds to carry out the provisions of this legislation, including the construction of the reservoirs, and whatever else is provided for in this bill, will come out of the Federal Treasury and charged to the taxpayers? May I ask the chairman of the committee whether that is so or not?

Mr. ENGLE. There is not any question about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much money will be used immediately from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ENGLE. It will cost about 55 percent, I think, of the total amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, almost all of these funds will be reimbursed.

Mr. ENGLE. They will all be paid back. What we said the other day was that the reclamation fund shall put up 55 percent of this money, \$760 million. The balance will come out of the general revenues of the Treasury, and that will amount to something less than \$18 million a year during the construction period of this project. All of that money is repaid, except something like \$8 million. In other words, this project pays back over 99 percent of the capital. That portion which is allocated—nearly two-thirds of it—to the generation of power and municipal water is paid back with interest. That portion, which is about \$283 million, for the irrigation feature, pays back in 50 equal annual installments, without interest, under the

half-century old precedent of the reclamation law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the chairman has made it clear that the actual cost against the Federal Government, against the taxpayers of this country, finally will amount to about 1 percent, is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. I said the nonreimbursable is about 1 percent. A little over \$8 million. But of course, if the gentleman wants to speak of the interest which is not being credited on the amount going into the irrigation development, of course that is an additional Federal subsidy, and that is traditional under the reclamation law as in all other projects.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The second question is this, whether or not any of the land that will be taken for irrigation purposes will be used for the purpose of producing crops in competition with crops that are presently in surplus. I have in mind especially wheat and corn, and other basic crops.

Mr. ENGLE. I have spoken on that twice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to make sure that none of the crops produced on this land will compete either directly or indirectly with the farm crops raised or produced in the Middle West. I have been given to understand that the effect of this legislation will really reduce the production of wheat, corn, cotton, and rice in this area.

Mr. ENGLE. Putting this land under irrigation, as in dealing with all sorts of dry land, has a tendency to move in the direction away from these surpluses. I cited to the committee during the discussion an example in the Columbia Basin, where 500,000 acres had been brought under irrigation to date, and that the acreage has been cut 90 percent. The major crop products giving our farmers trouble are, as you know, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the reason I make this inquiry.

Mr. ENGLE. Two of those are not raised in any quantity in this area. That is, corn and wheat. In my judgment, the taking of this area under water absolutely moves in the opposite direction from increased surpluses which are troubling the Commodity Credit Corporation and the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was going to try to clarify the phrase "traditional reclamation clause." When do they start paying back the \$282 million for irrigation projects? Do they start paying concurrently on that or do they wait for 50 years after the dam has been paid for, and having it interest free during that period at the expense of the taxpayers? I was about to ask the gentleman if he would ask that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REES of Kansas was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The provisions of this bill provide that payment of the irrigation allocation shall start the first year immediately after the development period, whatever that may be. It cannot exceed 10 years, in accordance with the reclamation law. It will be paid annually in 50 equal installments thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have received a considerable amount of correspondence that this legislation is beneficial to the Navaho Indians. I know the gentleman from Colorado, chairman of this committee, is quite familiar with the acute situation with respect to the Navaho Indians. It is a problem that concerns a good many of our people. A further statement from the chairman will be helpful.

Mr. ASPINALL. This legislation will be beneficial to the Navaho Indians. This legislation provides for the construction of the first facilities necessary to the ultimate irrigation of their land and the use by them of the waters to which they are entitled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I must first yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Kansas that much of this fund will be repaid in 19 years from irreplaceable natural resources of these four States, oil, gas, well leases, the reclamation fund, sale of public lands; and a total of \$155 million more under irrigation costing \$287 million.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much of that money—that is, \$287 million or \$155 million—is available for this project?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. It will be available when needed, \$23.3 million that these four States will pay into the reclamation fund from natural resources.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Kansas is the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is a very able gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman would want to ask somebody in charge of the bill, either the chairman or the ranking minority member how much this is going to increase Federal employment?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, can the gentleman point out how it would be possible to keep off the agricultural market the additional surpluses to be grown on more than 1 million acres of lands to be irrigated, and to be irrigated as supplemental irrigation? How can that be placed in separate warehouses or kept out of the general market depressing all prices throughout the country?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] the chairman of this committee has just explained that none of the basic products, including wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco will be in competition by reason of this project. The chairman has just stated that the production of the products I have just mentioned will be less than they are at the present time under dry farming, this for the reason that the lands will be used for growing alfalfa to feed cattle produced in that area, and most of the remainder for vegetables and fruits that will be consumed in that part of the country. So, it appears from the explanation of those who are familiar with the problem there will be no competition with crops raised in the area that either he or I represents.

I would like to say one more word with regard to the importance of providing food for the Navaho Indians. I am told that alfalfa and other feed that may be raised in this area will be used to feed livestock presently controlled for the Navaho Indians.

We are also advised that a considerable share of the vegetables and other products will be used by the Navaho Indians and thus relieve a critical situation that has existed among the Indians over a period of years. We are informed that several hundred million dollars has been spent in the last few years to relieve an acute situation in respect to food and other products in order to help the Indians who have suffered by reason of lack of rainfall in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, there is, to be sure, some Federal aid involved in this program—a reasonable contribution by the Government to the general welfare of the Nation. It most assuredly is not the fantastic collection of currency that has been so blithely bandied about by omnipotent opposition groups.

The simple facts are easily established although I hardly expect them to dent the tarnished armor of those who gleefully exploit their own distortions. How established? The Federal budget as submitted weighs many pounds and has hundreds of pages of figures for every sort and kind of expenditures. In this fabulous collection of numbers, reclamation, and reclamation alone, is singled out for this claptrap about the poor taxpayer absorbing ever increasing burdens of calculated interest. I defy anyone to give any commonsense explanation to this glaring inequity on the part of these taxpayer-savers other than one and one alone. This yawning gap stands out as clearly as an ink spot on a white shirt—and that is, that all logic failing to defeat reclamation, this double-dealing dodge has been concocted to do the job. Any ordinary search would find literally hundreds of items in the budget which should, or could, bear this same damning defamation if it has any logical validity.

By their acts—not their protestations—may you know them.

What are these items you ask—only these. Any item which by any definition could be a capital-type expenditure; roads, bridges, ships, buildings, harbors, flood control works, levees, soil building programs, and so on ad infinitum. If sudden death interest is to apply to one capital-type expenditure—and its evil shouted from the rooftops and worn as a badge of honor by budgeteers—then it should apply to all. The use of this calculated-compounding and confusion in only one area marks it as a handy tool for gravediggers—all others failing.

Reclamation and reclamation projects do pay their way to the Nation. Irrigation is of demonstrable value, for without irrigation, the West would be the harsh desert that Webster thought it would always be. With water, however, the desert blooms and creates wealth. No more could be asked of any program and whether private or public—and three-fourths of all irrigation development is private. It is a good investment for America.

Bypassing for a moment opposition from the nonreclamation area, there is considerable merit and enlightenment in examining the main nest of opposition and interest interpreters—namely those who seem also to have an affinity for southern California. This well-organized and well-heeled group apparently feels that age lends honor to Federal aid for no Federal aid proposed in this bill differs in concept or design from that which helped nurture and develop southern California. Let me state clearly that I think that the very growth and advancement of southern California, which rests upon basic Federal water development, is the best argument in support of this legislation. In fact in their very opposition, they have gone so far overboard that reflection and commonsense will distill from their frantic propaganda the true need and worth of this program in the upper basin area which supplies all the water.

I shall return to this unveiling in a moment, but let us finish this Federal aid, or as some would describe it, a subsidy bugbear. The House bill, H. R. 3383, proposes a total expenditure of \$760 million, of which less than 1 percent is on a grant or nonreturnable basis. The balance will all be returned to the Treasury. Of this return, approximately \$463 million will be returned with interest so no slick shenanigans will distort that. The balance, represented by irrigation projects, will be returned without interest. This has been the law on irrigation projects since 1902 when such free spenders as Teddy Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and others supported this concept. It has not suddenly become evil—it just makes predetermined opposition sound more valid. The figures are broken down in the committee report on the bill and clearly show that this return will be accomplished on schedule and that even more than that, a surplus will remain for future development.

You have heard or have seen, due to the enterprise of the well-heeled opposition, all sorts of figures on the Federal

aid involved. They are alike only in that they proceed from a similar distortion. Other than that, they are as elusive as a basket of eels and just as slippery. It is the hope of the digit-distorters that the shock will be enough that no examination will be made to check the validity.

I have no intention of entering this quagmire of quackery. Federal help of one form or another has been the rule and not the exception in this Nation since its first acts of funding the Continentals at par and establishing a tariff. We have such Federal aid right now in shipbuilding, in airmail, in airport construction, in agriculture, in mail service, in census service, and in rivers, harbors and flood control. If Federal assistance in such form is evil and an ever-compounding load upon the taxpayer, then let us in honesty and commonsense first make this assault upon those forms of aid which make no whit of direct return. Reclamation at least returns the principal.

I defy anyone to establish any morally sound argument that reclamation and reclamation alone should be battered by the brand of boondoggle when the very areas from which such branding comes sit in federally aided splendor.

Southern California parades its pious protest against erected evil in the upper Colorado project in complete indifference to the millions of taxpayer dollars the area has received without string or prospect of repayment for flood control, harbor improvement, and even a Federal program to let in some of its once pleasant sunshine through its own smog. Let us not be deceived by this smog blanket they are using to hide their own dependence upon help from the Federal Government as they seek to choke off legitimate development elsewhere of the very type they have heretofore supported, and will hereafter support when they are the beneficiaries. Their opposition has but one reason and purpose—one foundation. Southern California having received the manyfold benefits of grant development, like one flood-control project running to 348 millions, and reclamation development running to about 350 millions, to use water from a river to which she contributes not one drop, now trembles in terror lest this same type of valuable development occur elsewhere. They know from experience the value of basic reclamation development and they want it all for themselves and they seek by high-sounding means to prevent the fulfillment of a program they helped to conceive and supported, yes supported, until that day when its advantages were to accrue to others and not to themselves. This present dog-in-the-manger opposition runs counter to solemn agreements made by the State of California over a half-century. Small wonder that unprejudiced Californians refer to this resounding din as baloney. Inasmuch as they are receiving this same interest-free money for their development, and I for one, am a strong supporter of their projects as Colorado Representatives have always been, I think that in good conscience they should either stop spreading propaganda or offer to amend their own

projects to conform to their postulations about this one. I think also that they should honor their solemn agreements made in years gone by with the other States of the Colorado River Basin and not seek by present subterfuge to recapture what they solemnly agreed over the years was not theirs. Southern California contributes not one whit of water to the Colorado River—rather they approach it like a sponge to a puddle and seem to have a philosophy that it is better to take than to give as the States involved in this program are the source of over 90 percent of the water of the Colorado River; water divided by formal compact to the States now seeking to obtain use of their share.

Oh, its great sport to eternally damn our dams now that all of theirs are built—now that their power turbines are spewing out electric power not unlike they spew out propaganda—now that they are able to grow and prosper from water from snow hundreds of miles and several States away. Yes, it is great sport, but how can it be squared with their own arguments over the years and their own acceptance of our support for their development. If there is an answer, I am not so constituted as to understand it. To me, agreement and understanding must remain binding.

Do not be deceived into thinking that all of this is brand new for it is all very old and the record and the facts exist for those who wish to check it. Recently, my distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, demonstrated his fairness by reviewing this record. It can be found on page A1731 of the RECORD for February 23. Some of the most able men of Colorado took part in the long negotiations which were thought to have stilled the controversy over the use of the waters of the Colorado—formalized in an interstate compact at Sante Fe in 1922. They went to their eternal reward firm in the conviction that settlement had been achieved. Perhaps it is best that they are not here to see the dog turn on the hands that fed it.

I wish I had time to bare this whole record so that this calculated cloud of confusion could be cleared away, but I have not. It would not even be necessary to bring it up had not former friends deserted the ship and, fat and sassy from Federal feeding, begun to pump out adverse propaganda. It is a case of opposition based on self-interest.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, normally I deplore the use of theatrical tactics in the consideration of a bill. However, yesterday we had such a demonstration in connection with Chinle shale.

I have here today a core taken out by a diamond drill near the proposed site of Glen Canyon Dam. It is Chinle shale, too. My colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has just told us he is a geologist of sorts, and I invite his attention to this shale sample.

When I have finished speaking I will drink the water in the glass into which I put this core and any other contents remaining in the glass.

You know, one of the really amazing things about this particular legislation—

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I do not have time; I may later.

One of the really amazing things about this particular legislation has been the showmanship displayed by the opponents of this legislation from southern California. I think we have had more humbuggery and more buncombe exhibited on this legislation than any I can remember for a long time. They have entertained us throughout and I think they will continue to do so. Of course, the great theatrical capital of the world, Hollywood, is located in southern California and I suppose it comes as second nature to our friends to put on these shows for us. In the phrase of the moment, their performance has been a "many-splendored thing."

Our southern California friends, as each of the issues has come up—whether a dam could be built, whether there were uranium deposits which would be flooded, et cetera—have had counterproposals and counterevidence, and it has been quite a diversionary show. I know you have followed it in the past year in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In their attack on the Bureau of Reclamation—a magnificent body of engineers which has built 165 dams in this country in the last 50 years and never lost one, and that is consulted all over the world today on reclamation projects, in far-off Australia and in many other countries—they have attacked these engineers throughout. We have heard, just to give you a few illustrations, of collapsible dams, sliding canyons, counterpropaganda, counterblueprints, counterdams, counterengineers, countergeologists, counterhydrologists, counteragronomists, countereconomists, countergeographers, and countercartographers. Then, we had a comic strip in the Appendix featuring satire and broad exaggeration entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak."

Another entertaining strip was started later under the title "The Solid Gold Cadillac."

We have heard tales of boondoggling and mention of atomic reactors—of the just-around-the-corner variety—mind-reading, cloudseeding, and public-relations hypnotism. All of these things you have heard during the journey of this bill through the Congress. Then, too, there have been just plain old dead cats.

Why am I, from Arizona, here, as the southern Californians would say, betraying the lower basin States and my own State? I want to tell you why my Republican colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and I have supported this bill. We regard the Colorado River Basin as a community. This community sat down many years ago to work out a development plan. Unfortunately southern California got ahead of us when work began. Why, then, are we here supporting this measure? Not because our

State benefits from it but because we are keeping the agreement that our State made at that time. We are honoring it just as most of the gentlemen from northern California are honoring the agreement their State made. So we appear here and say to you: Do not break faith with these people in the upper basin of the Colorado. Let us give them the project and the development they were promised under the agreement of these seven States.

There we have the picture. Do not believe for a moment that if a dam is built anywhere above Hoover Dam, the water will deplete away, or evaporate away, or percolate away, or sneak off to some subterranean chamber as the opponents would have it. If the Bureau of Reclamation says you can build a dam at a particular place, you may rest assured that it will hold water and that it will be just as successful as the other 165 dams have been.

May I pay just two tributes which I think are well earned. I do not know of a more conscientious Member in this House, or one who works harder and longer on the business of the House, than the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. I would like to congratulate him on the very remarkable and fair-minded job he has done on this bill. I also wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], for the high degree of water statesmanship he has shown in this matter. He has done great credit to himself and to his State in the manner in which he has handled this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to section 1 appearing in the printed report be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 8, following the word "and", insert the word "for." Strike the comma following the word "power."

Page 2, line 9, following the word "purposes", strike the words "hereby authorizes."

Page 2, line 10, following the word "Interior", insert the words "is hereby authorized."

Page 2, line 14, strike the words "Echo Park,". Following the words "Flaming Gorge", insert the words ", Navajo (dam and reservoir only),

Page 3, line 10, following the word "Silt", insert the word "and". Strike the comma following the words "Smith Fork" and insert a period in lieu thereof.

Pages 3, 4, and 5, strike everything beginning on page 3, line 11, through page 5, line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navaho (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedska-dee, Silt, and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

"Sec. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works pro-

posed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

"In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit.

"SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for, the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'basin fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 8.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River

storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project: (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act.

"(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed 100 years;

"(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years.

"(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the upper division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 percent; Utah, 21.5 percent; Wyoming, 15.5 percent; and New Mexico, 17 percent: *Provided*, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the basin fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

"Revenue so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section

6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this act, (2) costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the basin fund.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters appor-

tioned to the States of the upper Colorado River basin.

"SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navaho initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

"SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

"SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this act, but not to exceed \$760 million.

"SEC. 13. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payment of costs of participation projects herein and hereafter authorized in the State of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an

action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

"SEC. 16. As used in this act—

"The terms 'Colorado River Basin,' 'Colorado River compact,' 'Colorado River system,' 'Lee Ferry,' 'States of the upper division,' 'upper basin,' and 'domestic use' shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

"The term 'States of the upper Colorado River Basin' shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

"The term 'upper Colorado River Basin' shall have the same meaning as the term 'upper basin';

"The term 'upper Colorado River Basin compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

"The term 'Rio Grande compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

"The term 'treaty with the United Mexican States' shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

"The term 'economic life,' as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in 'replacement costs' for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life."

Mr. ENGLE (interrupting reading of the substitute). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as having been read and open to amendment at any point, calling attention to the fact that a committee print has been made available to all Members and, in addition, the substitute amendment appears in the supplemental report filed by the committee on February 14, 1956, and has been available since that time with other explanatory matters for the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the chairman tell us what this particular parlia-

mentary move is for? Is this a new bill instead of H. R. 3383? Is this a completely new bill?

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman had read the supplemental report, I think he would understand that we are trying to offer a series of committee amendments in an orderly way, and in order to do that, we have the permission of the House to file a supplemental report, which we did some 2 weeks ago, and incorporated the committee amendments in a substitute because that was the most orderly way to do it. Now, we could offer them from the floor one after another, but the way it is done here the Members of the House and of the Committee of the Whole have the whole document before them and they have the committee amendments in italics so they can identify them, and they have them all explained in the supplemental report.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They could be acted upon separately after the substitute is accepted?

Mr. ENGLE. No; except that the gentleman can offer an amendment to strike out any portion.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I see.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, will the bill then be read section by section from Committee Print No. 10?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is offering is an amendment to the bill and it is considered in its entirety as an amendment. The gentleman from California has asked unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment, which is 7 or 8 pages long, I may say, be dispensed with.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then, Mr. Chairman, would an amendment to section, let us say, 7, be considered at the time section 7 of the committee print is read?

The CHAIRMAN. After the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is read in its entirety, the amendment is then open to amendment at any point.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment is the subject matter of the supplemental report which was filed with this House February 14, 1956.

As I explained to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] the reason we adopted this procedure is because we wanted to proceed in an orderly manner. There are several of these amendments which came up with reference to this very complicated piece of legislation after the original bill was voted out of our committee in July of last year. One of them deals with the protection of certain of the recreational and scenic areas involved, and the other major amendment deals with the execution of an agreement with reference to the repayment of this project. All of these amendments would be germane if offered separately and could have been offered separately, but we felt that the House would want to know that the committee considered these amendments and took formal action upon them. However, under the rules of the House, it is not possible to refer to action taken in any committee

unless that action has been reported to the House.

So, as a consequence, in order to be able to discuss here in the House the action taken by the committee with reference to these amendments, it was necessary for us to file a supplemental report reporting on our action. We came on the floor of the House and secured the unanimous consent to file a supplemental report, and the supplemental report is before you, explaining the additional amendments that have been put into the bill, with the substitute bill set forth in the supplemental report on page 6 of that report, and then commencing on page 12 of the report each one of these amendments—and there are 9 of them all together to various parts of the bill—are described in detail with reference to what they do.

In addition to that, the bill is set forth in the report with strikeouts and italics in order to show the difference. In addition, for the convenience of the Members and those who might want to amend the substitute, which, of course, is open to amendment at any point now, the committee has provided a committee print No. 10 which is available to the Members, which sets up the bill, H. R. 3383, precisely as it was voted out of the Committee on the Interior with the amendments adopted at that time. The additional amendments referred to in the supplemental report are in italics and the change of language where it does occur is shown in strikeouts. That is done in order that any Member desiring to offer an amendment to the substitute may have a clear opportunity to do so.

The amendment proposed by the committee in its supplemental report incorporates all of the amendments recommended by the committee in its report of July 8, 1955, and which are set out in the Union Calendar Print No. 317, with the exception of one amendment adding a new section 13; and as pointed out in the supplemental report, recent actions have made the inclusion of section 13 unnecessary.

This committee print shows, as I have said, the amendments that have been incorporated in the committee-recommended amendments set out in the supplemental report in addition to the amendments recommended in the initial report.

As I said previously, the amendments are discussed at page 12. Amendment No. 1 relates to the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Amendment No. 2 deletes a small project, the Woody Creek project in Colorado from those projects which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning. It is a change in the planning section and is not of any great importance.

Amendment No. 3 adds the Yellow Jacket project in northwestern Colorado to those which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning further developments.

The balance of these amendments have for their purpose effectuating the control agreement in the upper Colorado basin States with reference to management of their funds. It does not change the total repayment at all. It is a book-

keeping matter on which they got together and which is internal to their own problem. That subject matter is going to be discussed in more detail by the author of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Am I correct in understanding that the changes to which the gentleman has referred are in italics on pages 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the supplemental report?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the Chairman tell the members of the committee just what hearings were held on the amendments which appear there in italics?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that this whole subject matter was the subject of days and days and days of hearings and that these amendments were not any different from any other subject matter before the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman tell the members of the committee what hearings were held on the amendments which appear in italics?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that all the hearings that were held on this subject were on all of the amendments to this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to call the committee's attention to the fact that the amendments which you are now being asked to vote upon, particularly with reference to the division of revenues and other detailed provisions in the substitute, are amendments upon which there has been absolutely no testimony before any congressional committee. These are matters which were never considered by our committee and you are now being asked to vote upon them without their having been even discussed in the committee, except by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY to the committee amendment: At the end of the first full sentence of section 4 of the committee proposed amendment, which occurs, for reference in the committee print, at page 6, line 7, strike the period, insert a colon and add the following: "Provided further, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

(Mr. AVERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. We have no objection on this side to the gentleman's amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment and in fact helps the legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no objection to the amendment. As I understand, it goes to surplus crops, and I think it has been shown that the wheat and corn lands are taken out of production by irrigation projects because very little wheat or corn is irrigated, less than 1 percent. I think the amendment would be acceptable.

Mr. AVERY. I thank both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Nebraska for their support of my amendment. It has been alleged on the floor of the House ever since I have been a Member that these reclamation projects do not bring new land into production of the basic commodities. I think that is basically true. That is why I have offered this amendment, only to write into the law what has been said on the floor of the House at such times as we have considered reclamation projects.

This amendment does not do all I would like to have it do. You note it only prevents the production of these basic crops for 10 years. When you get down to the fine print, we are not getting as much as I would like to have, because it will take probably 5 or 6 years to develop these projects, so actually all we have left is a 2- or 3-year guaranty. However, I think it is important that this House recognize now that we cannot promiscuously continue to bring new land into production of the basic commodities unless we give a look at what it is doing to our midwestern economy, where especially our small farmers are compelled annually to decrease their production of the crops that are so vital to them.

May I especially thank the gentleman from California, who has worked so hard on reclamation legislation for the Western States, for recognizing this problem. I appreciate his accepting the amendment.

Because of my intense interest in water conservation I want to support the legislation before the House this afternoon. However, in its present form I do not feel that in justice to the farmers in my district that I could vote in favor of the bill. As I stated before, it is always alleged when the House is considering a proposal to reclaim and furnish water to new acres of land that these acres will not be placed in competition in the production of crops that are raised in the Middle West. That contention is probably true, but if it is true we should make provision in legislation authorizing further reclamation projects that crops competing with the Middle West cannot be produced. This is especially true under present conditions when the farmers of northeast Kansas are being required to reduce their acres of wheat

and corn, the two principal crops in our district. It is for this reason that I am presenting this amendment to the House this afternoon and urging its adoption. I can understand the reservations on the part of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], who has rendered great service to the irrigated sections on the western slopes of Colorado. He tells me that he feels like it is discriminating against this project to include such an amendment, when similar projects previously authorized have not had this restriction placed on them.

However, that should not preclude the adoption of this amendment this afternoon because our surplus of basic commodities is more critical than any time in our history. Just because this restriction is a few years late in being adopted by Congress in the authorization of reclamation projects does not justify the further delay of writing it into the legislation we are considering today. The farmers in my district are more in need of such protective legislation than they have been at any time in the past. As I stated earlier in my remarks, this amendment does not do all that I hoped to accomplish by its submission.

In prohibiting the production of basic crops for 10 years, the prohibition naturally would only apply to 2 or 3 years, as these projects will probably not be completed to the stage where the reclaimed acres would be placed into production until about 6 or 7 years from now. I had hoped to get agreement on a 20-year prohibition but the committee was unwilling to accept the amendment for a period of that duration. Therefore we have compromised on the 10-year provision as read by the clerk, and I am asking that it be adopted, in order that the Congress go on record as recognizing the inequity of spending public funds to bring additional land into production when the farmers of my district are faced with extremely low acreage allotments.

As I stated before I feel that water conservation is of top priority to this Nation. The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in its report to the President states that the water needs of this country by 1970 will be twice as great as they are today. In view of this carefully prepared report I feel it is imperative that water be stored in every instance that it is economically feasible. This program I feel is justified as it is not disrupting the social and economic conditions of the area. Practically no persons will be displaced by these reservoirs, and the land being inundated is of small value other than its scenic value. The benefits occurring from these projects will be distributed among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona. Since much land in these States is still public land I feel these States are justified in their request for the authorization of this project. This is especially true in lieu of the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that less than 1 percent of the cost of the entire project will not be reimbursable to the Federal Government. These repayments will come from water rights and power sales.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I do so for this reason. It is nugatory except as to the Paonia project. I believe it was the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] who stated yesterday or the day before that there would not be any production out of this entire group of projects until beyond 10 years from now except possibly on the Paonia project. Paonia has in part been authorized before. As I understand it, it was more or less a bringing together of new portions of it along with the old.

I think the effect of the amendment would be unfair with respect to the people in that particular area. It therefore should not be in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to understand why this amendment is before us. If basic crops cannot be grown on irrigated lands, why have the amendment at all? The fact is, of course, that you can grow basic crops on irrigated land. The fact is you can grow feed grains and compete with my part of the country. That is what I am interested in.

I do not care two hoots in a vinegar barrel about this fight between southern California and the intermountain area. I was interested to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority floor leader, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] make their speeches yesterday morning in behalf of this bill. I did not know that Massachusetts has all the industries it wants or needs. I did not know that the State of Indiana has all the industries it wants or needs. I did not know that they do not have an agricultural problem in Indiana. We have an agricultural problem in Iowa, and we need industry in Iowa. This bill, providing the cheap power that it does, means that industry will move out to that part of the country and not into the State of Iowa. We cannot get industry in Iowa. Industry will follow this power; and agricultural production will follow irrigation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, one of the basic crops is corn, which is raised in abundance in the State of Iowa, and this amendment provides that no corn is to be raised and put into the competitive market, and the gentleman should be happy that we have the amendment and he should support it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it makes the bill just a little less worse—that is all—just a little less worse.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is that the reason the gentleman is opposing the amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is the reason.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman know what the six basic crops are?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Let us have them.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the gentleman tell me?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell you.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Colorado is on the Committee on Agriculture. He ought to know the six basic crops.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that only 40 percent of the corn growers in his own State subscribe to the agricultural program, and 60 percent of them grow their corn outside of the basic act? What have you got to bellyache on that?

Mr. GROSS. We want that market for our feed grain instead of your producing it with money that is provided by all of the taxpayers of the United States to irrigate your land.

Mr. HILL. I do not have a foot of irrigated land, but I just wanted to be sure that we know what we are talking about.

Mr. GROSS. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that the gentleman from Colorado yields to me.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa wants to go back to Iowa and tell his farmers that he is in favor of subsidizing all of the corn production?

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote against the bill.

Mr. AVERY. What is the gentleman going to do about this amendment? That is the question we are debating here.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote against the amendment because, in my opinion, it is a subterfuge to sell this bill to the people from the Midwest. We are not only interested in agriculture. We are just as much interested in industry as anybody else. We need industry in Iowa. But you are drawing industry out of our part of the country and other parts of the country because of the power that will be generated.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I cannot quite follow the gentleman in this discussion and understand how he twists my amendment around so as to apply it to power, which is provided by these projects.

Mr. GROSS. In the first place, your amendment is limited to 10 years.

Mr. AVERY. I so stated on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. If Ezra Benson has his way, and I refer this to his colleagues from Utah who are here supporting this bill—if Ezra Benson has his way he will have the farmers of Iowa liquidated in 10 years, and I do not intend to let that happen. Of course, we can throw the gates open and let irrigated farms in the West produce what we ought to be producing in the State of Iowa. But I am not going to stand here and be a party to

gutting Iowa farmers now or at the end of 10 years.

Mr. AVERY. Would the gentleman care to amend my amendment so that it would be extended to 20 years?

Mr. GROSS. I am not interested in amending any amendment to this bill. I am going to vote against it.

Mr. AVERY. I believe the gentleman so stated just a moment ago.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I did.

Mr. AVERY. But it seems to me that with this amendment, if the corn farmers are going to be gone in 10 years that without the amendment they might be gone in 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. I said that if Ezra Benson had his way the farmers of Iowa would be liquidated in 10 years or less.

Mr. AVERY. I do not recall that my amendment applied to Mr. Benson.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that eventually we can impress upon some people in Washington that we are in trouble and we can head off the liquidation of farmers that is now taking place in Iowa.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. GROSS. We stand today upon the threshold of power generation through the use of nuclear energy. Plants for the generation of electric power through the use of atomic energy need not be located in the Rocky Mountains. Plants for this purpose can and should be located in the Midwest, where we need a balance of agriculture and industry—where there are already abundant food supplies at hand to feed industry.

There is no need for further agricultural production. Existing farms and farmers are abundantly capable of supplying the Nation's needs for food and fiber, and for many years to come. There is absolutely no need at this time to spend perhaps \$3 billion on such a project as this, either from the standpoint of power or agricultural production.

(Mr. WILSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to the upper Colorado River project. My position on the record will show that I am convinced that his project is not economically feasible nor is it consistent with sound reclamation procedures.

There have been many cogent arguments advanced in opposition to this legislation.

Concurrent with the consideration of this legislation is the problem of vast agricultural surpluses. The President has submitted to the Congress for consideration a solution to these agricultural surpluses which I heartily endorse.

Since vast surpluses have not only burdened the economy with subsidies running into billions but have partially darkened the farm economy with a cloud of falling prices, it has been necessary for the sponsors of such reclamation projects as these to invent a means of justification based upon pure speculation of future needs.

The favorite date when they say that the grim spectre of famine will come—unless we heed their advice—is 1975. To meet the vast appetite of 200 million

people in that year, the Bureau of Reclamation asks that before 1959 there be authorized and initiated the irrigation of 1,400,000 new acres and that there be supplementary water provided for 1,711,700 acres now irrigated and in cultivation. For this the minimum construction cost would be \$2,110,834,000—a per-acre cost of \$700.

Reference to authorities in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere will show the utterly groundless nature of this claim for more irrigated land, in 1975 or any other year. Here I should like to call attention to another survey made from data gathered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. This shows that there now exists on improved farms nearly 21 million acres of good land lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern and Midwestern States. This land is neither woodland, pasture, nor publicly owned. It is located in regions where there is plenty of rainfall and, in most States, where the growing season is much longer than in the upper Colorado region. All that might be needed to bring this land into cultivation would be an expenditure of from \$50 to \$150 an acre when and if there is need for more food and fiber. The distribution of this presently existing "soil bank" is as follows:

<i>South</i>	
	<i>Acres</i>
Alabama.....	823, 564
Arkansas.....	2, 723, 547
Kentucky.....	671, 673
Louisiana.....	2, 487, 300
Mississippi.....	1, 270, 691
Tennessee.....	279, 563
Total.....	8, 256, 338
<i>Southeast</i>	
Florida.....	2, 037, 392
Georgia.....	972, 748
North Carolina.....	4, 264, 763
South Carolina.....	422, 309
Virginia.....	919, 307
Total.....	8, 686, 519
<i>Midwest</i>	
Illinois.....	627, 185
Indiana.....	231, 780
Michigan.....	1, 761, 390
Minnesota.....	564, 702
Ohio.....	491, 098
Wisconsin.....	124, 133
Iowa.....	50, 759
Missouri.....	143, 249
Total.....	3, 994, 296
Grand total.....	20, 937, 153

This, I repeat, is a soil bank already in being. But with production bursting at the seams on the land already cultivated, this reserve need not be touched for years to come.

Indeed, the necessity now faces the Congress to put more millions into the reserve. This is what is meant by the soil-bank plan submitted by the President to Congress. That would retire 40 million acres which are now in cultivation. This will mean that between the American people and the famine portrayed by sponsors of more irrigation, these are no less than 61 million potentially productive acres.

Even to consider irrigating the 1,223,000 acres in the Colorado Basin contem-

plated in S. 500 while we are attempting to eliminate 40 million that we do not need is a matter so irrational as to suggest that it could only happen in the mystic land of political legislation the land in which regional and bureaucratic ambitions are paramount and the national interest is forgotten.

But the proponents of this project have apparently convinced some people, including themselves, that the crops to be raised upon these high arid slopes are a very special kind of crops—rare, exotic, never to be in surplus, and highly essential to the Nation's welfare. The reality is that the produce to be raised will be just like the crops that are raised on millions and millions of acres now in cultivation. They are mostly grains, dairy products—from the cattle which eat the forage which is to be raised on the land and which the proponents say is not in surplus—and wool from the sheep which also partake of the said forage.

Because the reclamation of these additional acres will only serve to compound the expense and proportion of the existing agricultural problem, I oppose the passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 16, delete section 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. The impounding and use of water for the generation of electrical power and energy at all such facilities in the Colorado River Basin, shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes, and the United States shall not withhold water in storage in contravention of this mandate. In the event that any State of the Colorado River Basin seeks to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce any of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Mexican Water Treaty or of this act, consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit. Consent is hereby given to joinder of the United States as a party to any suit, action or proceeding brought in any court of competent jurisdiction upon any cause of action arising under any contract lawfully entered into by the United States pursuant to either of the compacts or the acts named in this section."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I offer this amendment in view of the fact that in southern California we are a little bloody at this time. But the purpose of this amendment can be simply stated.

In section 7 of the committee amendment which you will find on page 12, you will find that there are certain rights that are guaranteed. However, there is no machinery set up to enforce section 7.

On page 16 you will find them more or less reiterated in section 14. My amendment is a redrafting of section 14 in order to give to the States the things which they say are provided in section 7. It seems to me that if anybody is really sincere in saying that they meant that they said in the language of section 7 and section 14, there can be absolutely no objection to the amendment which has been offered. We have simply spelled it out and we have provided the machinery and we have made it apply to the entire act instead of just to section 14.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the gentleman mind stating why he did not submit this amendment to the committee so that it could have been considered? These are very technical matters. The gentleman says it is a very fair and a very good amendment, but he drops it upon our desk 5 minutes before he is supposed to offer it. We do not regard that as the way to present legislation of a very technical nature. I think it goes to the question of whether or not the gentleman wanted us to have a good look at it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did not have your substitute amendment available for consideration until the last moment yesterday. Yesterday was the first time I could get it. I discussed the amendment with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. It was available to you many days ago. It is very simple. It would take about 10 minutes to read and understand it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I note in the last line that "Consent is hereby given to joinder of the United States as a party to any suit."

Does not this point up the whole thing to a lawsuit between the Lower Basin States, which could be very complicated and be in the courts for many years?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Section 7 already directs that local contracts shall not be impaled. My language makes it possible for machinery to carry out section 7 exactly as it is worded in section 7.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just why is this amendment necessary?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because there is no machinery provided in section 7 to carry it out, and unless it is provided all you have done is to write in a pious hope without giving the injured parties any recourse.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. To clarify the point as to whether this committee has had this matter before it or not, it is the substance of an amendment I offered in both the subcommittee and in the full committee during the hearings on this bill with respect to enlarging the opportunities for justice in case the Secretary conducts his operations under this act in violation of the law and the contract rights of all those who are involved on the river.

As the gentleman has said, it is a very fair thing to provide machinery for the quick decision—as quick as you can get out of the courts—of what may be in issue in connection with the Secretary's activities.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Just a statement substantiating that made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], that we have had this before our committee in various forms, and each time it has been voted down by approximately a vote of 20 to 6.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then the objection of my friend from California is withdrawn, that he has not had time. I assume you have had plenty of time to consider it.

Mr. ASPINALL. I understood my chairman to say that he had not seen this particular version. That I think is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. The way these legal sharpshooters who have made a living for some 25 or 30 years out of interpreting the various acts on the Colorado River take each word and turn it endwise, edgewise, sidewise, and flatwise to see what it means or does to the basic law of the river—any change in language requires the most microscopic attention, and I regard any language that comes in as different, as new language.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman would just let me use some of my own time I would like to proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. I assure the gentleman I will be very glad to seek additional time for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have been presented here with a substitute amendment; it is quite voluminous and is in substitution of the bill. In place of reading each one of the sections, as is ordinarily done, to give the membership a chance to look at these different sections, to scrutinize them, we are presented with them en bloc.

It seems to me that the gentleman's request is a normal request that his amendment be considered, and I would ask at this time, if the gentleman will yield for that purpose, to have the amendment reread; because, as I understand the amendment it seeks to furnish machinery to do just exactly what they claim they want to do in section 14 where it says, "Consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits."

And again the same language is used in section 7, the same identical language is used there. It seems to me that language is also the permission of a State to have access to the courts.

As I understand, the gentleman's amendment just provides explicit means by which that consent can be obtained without difficulty.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is quite right; and I want to reemphasize exactly what he said. You are asked to vote a substitute amendment today without a chance to read it, without a chance to have it read to you, but it is objected now that this amendment should not be considered merely because the chairman of the committee has only had perhaps a couple of hours to actually look at it.

Let me say also to the chairman of this committee that if these are legal questions, I would point out that this whole bill is a legal matter; and if it provides the machinery to enforce what this bill purports to say, certainly it is only fair that the machinery should be spelled out and that the parties concerned should have an equal right to protect themselves under the terms of this act; and that is all that this amendment does: Gives to the various interested parties the machinery through which they can protect themselves in case there is any violation of this act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman has taken only part of article 4, the Colorado River compact, which is already covered in this bill. If the Colorado River compact is covered in this bill, as in sections 7 and in 14, what is the necessity for the gentleman's amendment save and except to put the State of California in a position to institute a lawsuit that it may not have at the present time?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. The gentleman quite misreads it. I emphasize a certain part of the compact in order that it can be made very clear that the Congress does not mean in any way to change the compact. So we have emphasized that. However, it applies to all of the States in the lower basin and it would apply equally, I might add, to the upper Colorado River States because, to give you an example, suppose some of this water or some of these dams that are not for agricultural purposes were being stored in dry times and that water was held behind those dams and the water was not made available for agricultural purposes, under this language it would be right and proper for the agricultural interests to insist that the

storage of that water should cease and desist until the agricultural purposes have been taken care of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman if it is in the compact at the present time and you have copied only a part of it, why does the gentleman then bring it in so that a lawsuit could be instituted only on one phase of it when, as he says, it is already in there? Why do you single out this particular one phase?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is one phase which has been in dispute between those who would build these dams solely for power and those who would feel that the consumptive rights of those for domestic and agricultural purposes must be protected in both the upper and lower basin.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Under the interpretation by the Southern California lawyers, if this language is put in the bill it would be illegal, would it not, to build Glen Canyon?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; it would not be illegal to build Glen Canyon. It would be illegal to store water in the Glen Canyon dam so that enough water would not come down the river and the people in Arizona and the other areas in the southern basin would not be able to get sufficient water for their agricultural and consumptive purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] touched on the vital point of this amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to block us from building any storage dams in the upper-basin area, particularly the Glen Canyon Dam. This amendment is very ingeniously devised to do that very thing. Those of us who have listened to the testimony of Mr. Ely and the other counsel from southern California know that their contention has always been that we cannot use this water for any other purpose than what they term beneficial consumptive use, which means we cannot store it to produce electrical energy. All we can do is drink it and irrigate our lands. We cannot store it. That is the purpose of the amendment. The gentleman in order to achieve that end is asking you to take a provision out of the Colorado River compact and write it into this act.

I want to remind you again that on page 14 of the substitute this clause is contained:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act or the Colorado River compact.

So the effect of that provision is to make the Colorado River compact a part of this act. Why we should take one particular provision out of context from the compact and write it into this act is not understandable at all. If you are

going to put one provision in we might as well write the whole compact into the bill. What the committee has done is to attempt to make this act subject to the provisions of the upper Colorado River compact. What the gentleman proposes to do is to pick out one part that he likes and take it out of context and make it subject to the interpretation that counsel for southern California has attempted to apply to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to direct your attention to the fact it is part of article 4, section B, of the Colorado River compact, only part of it, but then he slides these words in front of it saying "impounding and use of the water for the generation of electrical power and energy." Now, that part is not article 4-B, because article 4-B says "subject to the provisions of this compact the waters in the Colorado River." You see, the trick is in slipping in and substituting the words "impounding and use of the water for the generation of electrical power and energy." They try to evade the provisions of the Colorado River compact itself which their signatories agreed to, and that is what it amounts to. Therefore, it should be voted down.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I further call the committee's attention to the fact that on page 16 there is this provision:

In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply—

That is, with the provisions of the upper Colorado River compact—

any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

So they have the right to come into court if there is a violation. There is absolutely no reason for this amendment, and I hope you vote it down.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact, is it not, that this kind of language could be the basis of a lawsuit that would tie up and frustrate and stop the construction of this project?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Undoubtedly there would be a lawsuit the day after this bill is passed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], has seen fit to offer his amendment, because it smokes out what I have known for a long time but have been unable to get the upper Colorado advocates to admit, that this is not a reclamation project. This is a public power project, with some incidental benefits. And, can you not see the proponents striving and screaming immediately that they do not want this amendment be-

cause it will interfere with power? If the provisions of the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has offered are actually accepted and incorporated in this bill, it will compel the Secretary of the Interior to operate this entire project not as a power project as the folks in the upper basin want it to be, but he will have to operate it as an irrigation project. Therefore you will see the proponents unanimously united against this amendment because they are not interested so much in reclamation. They want this a power project, and that is what it is. I congratulate the gentleman from California for having offered his amendment. I think it should be put in the bill, because it at least shows just what the purpose of the upper basin is—not to provide reclamation but to provide power.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just simply say that in the reading of article 4-B of the compact, I think it can be twisted, as I think it has been twisted, but I think the words are very plain and should be read again: Subject to the provisions of this compact, which means the division of the waters, water of the Colorado River may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent the use for such dominant purposes. My amendment makes it possible to enforce that part of the section and make sure that this will not be used, and what other purpose can Echo Dam be built for except for power purposes at the expense of agriculture and consumptive uses? They just cannot answer that question.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman is entirely correct, because the proponents have admitted, when they build Glen Canyon Dam, it will not put one drop of water on an acre of land. This is strictly a power feature and the principal part of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The language which has just been called to our attention, which was read by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is in the bill. It is the last sentence of section 7. It reads:

Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River basin.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say that I know that is in the amendment and if the proponents of this proposed piece of legislation really believed it, they should not object to having placed in the

bill the mechanism for putting it into effect.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is redundant; that is what it amounts to. May I also say this, if the gentleman will be good enough to yield further, that the reason it is necessary to store the water, as the gentleman knows, is that the upper basin States are unable to use this water because of the erratic flow of the river; the water comes off in a very few weeks, in the late spring and early summer, and unless we are placed in a position to catch the water, the lower basin water, so that we can deliver it in conformity with the provisions of the Colorado River compact to the lower basin, then we are unable to build the necessary small reservoirs in the upper basin so that we can use the water later in the summer during the growing season. That is the reason for all of this.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that although the present bill consents to suits against the United States, it does not provide for the joinder of the United States in situations where you have suits between States of the basin. Of course, the Supreme Court decision in 1936 said it was essential for the United States to be joined in such suits and as a consequence, if it is essential, you should provide for it here. Otherwise you are preventing the disposition of proper legal questions. Likewise the amendment also provides in cases that arise in connection with power contractors—and that is where most of the litigation, if any would arise—they would have the similar privilege of coming into court, bringing the proper parties in.

I ask you gentlemen if in the United States you are going to permit people to go to court and have their rights litigated, which is a part of our Constitution, why, for goodness sake, is anybody objecting to providing the machinery for doing it? That is all that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] seeks to do. I urge very seriously the adoption of this amendment. It has a good purpose and it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate at this late stage in the consideration of this measure to trespass upon the time of the Committee. I think it should be said, however, that the debate on this bill has been thorough; it has been of high quality; it has been energetic and at times controversial. I think nevertheless it is fair to state that it has not been sectional and it has not been partisan. Those who have supported the bill have proceeded upon the theory that what is good for any great

section of the country is good for the country as a whole.

It has been pointed out over and over again that this bill had the support of the previous administration, and it has the support of the present administration. It has passed the Senate by a sizable majority; it has wide, substantial bipartisan support in the House.

Without adding a partisan flavor to this debate, I think I can say to my colleagues on my side of the aisle that the development of the upper Colorado is consistent with the long and proud record of Democratic Congresses which have lent their support to the development of the great water and soil resources of all sections of the country. In the 1952 Democratic platform, the following specific pledge was made to the American people:

The Democratic Party is dedicated to a continuation of the natural resources development policy inaugurated and carried out under the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and to the extension of that policy to all parts of the Nation—North, South, East, Midwest, West, and the Territories—to the end that the Nation and its people receive maximum benefits from these resources to which they have an inherent right.

Our party has supported the development of the Tennessee Valley, the Pacific Northwest, New England, the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys, and the great projects in the lower Colorado region. We have supported the conservation of our soil and water resources in every State in the Union. We have favored consistently the development of all of our natural resources and their full utilization for the benefit of all the people of our country.

It has been suggested that the development of the upper Colorado will add to the burdensome farm surpluses which now depress farm prices. The amendment to which the committee has agreed renders that argument moot. Personally, I doubt that any such amendment is necessary. With our expanding population and with the ever improving diet of the American people, the question of surpluses can only be a temporary one. The fact that surpluses exist today is no argument that there will be surpluses 5 years from today. Within the last 5 or 6 years we have seen surpluses come and go. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense were calling upon farmers to increase their production of wheat, cotton, corn, and other agricultural products and to reach unprecedented goals. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that the cotton supply situation was such that an embargo was placed upon the exportation of cotton from the United States. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that farmers and stockmen were being encouraged to increase their cattle production. I recall very well that at that time the Office of Price Stabilization was undertaking to roll back the price of beef. My colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture will recall that our greatest problems at the beginning of the Korean war were those which related to efforts on the part of the administration to hold down the

prices of farm products and to encourage farmers to increase their harvests.

The principle of the soil bank recommended by the Department of Agriculture and many others is not simply one of reducing the surpluses of today, but of preparing for the shortages of tomorrow. The great undeveloped West is the greatest soil bank in America. The diet and health standards of future Americans require us to initiate the long-term development of the upper Colorado region now.

The committee has done an excellent job in working out the controversial features of this measure in eliminating Echo Park Dam and in strengthening and improving the bill generally. I urge my colleagues to support the committee substitute and on final passage to vote for the bill as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on Monday of this week, the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the House Committee on Agriculture the administration's farm program. It is now available as a Committee Print; that is, the administration farm program. I was able to obtain a copy of it only yesterday and I regret that I did not recall one provision in the bill when I had the floor a few moments ago. That is my reason for taking the floor now. It is to point out that in the administration farm bill, corn is removed as a basic commodity.

The amendment adopted a few minutes ago applies only to basic commodities. This simply means that if the administration's farm program becomes law, and corn is dropped from the list of basic commodities, the principal feed grain crop in Iowa will have no protection whatever under the amendment.

This administration on one hand supports legislation calling for the taking of land out of production in the Middle-west and on the other hand supports this legislation that will put vast areas into production. And adoption of this 10-year amendment is the worst kind of a sop to those who come from the great corn-growing areas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR as a substitute for the committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an inci-

dent of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain a dam in or near Glen Canyon, Ariz., together with a powerplant, incidental works, and necessary main transmission lines to load centers, hereinafter referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam project: *Provided*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument and (2) to make the net revenues collected in the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam project available to the States of the upper Colorado River basin to construct irrigation projects as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'basin fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam project shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Glen Canyon Dam project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, and (2) expenditure as authorized by subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be made available to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin for the exclusive use in constructing whatever irrigation projects (including incidental power generating and transmission facilities) that the States may choose to construct or have constructed within their respective boundaries: *Provided*, That the revenues in the Basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, to wit: 46 percent to the State of Colorado; 17 percent to the State of New Mexico; 21.5 percent to the State of Utah; and 15.5 percent to the State of Wyoming: *Provided further*, That whenever a State of the upper Colorado River Basin no longer is able to use for the construction of irrigation projects the revenues in the Basin Fund available to it, such revenues shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(e) The several States shall submit annual business-type budgets to the Secretary of the Interior reflecting the expenditures of revenues made available to the States from the Basin Fund for the construction of irrigation projects.

"Sec. 3. The only limitation on the use of the revenues from the basin fund by the several States of the upper Colorado River Basin shall be that the revenues must be expended for the construction of irrigation projects. The Secretary of the Interior shall have no authority to designate which irrigation projects shall be built with the use of revenues from the basin fund, nor shall he have any discretion to withhold funds for the construction of any irrigation projects that the several States of the upper Colorado River Basin or each of them may choose to construct or have constructed.

"SEC. 4. The entire cost of constructing the Glen Canyon Dam project shall be non-reimbursable, but operation and maintenance costs shall be paid from revenues from the sale of power generated by the project, as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 5. No dam, irrigation project or incidental unit thereof may be constructed pursuant to authority of this act, or with revenues made available by this act, by the Secretary of the Interior, or any State or subdivision thereof, within the boundaries of a national park or monument.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the Glen Canyon Dam project, the Secretary of the Interior shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the application of the Federal reclamation laws to the construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation projects constructed in the upper Colorado River Basin pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with the other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact, the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Glen Canyon Dam project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law.

"SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 9. Before any money is appropriated for the construction of the storage units, powerplants or participating projects named in this act, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate in his judgment to insure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of said works incurred by the United States and the repayment within 50 years from the date of the completion of said works, or all amounts advanced under this act for such works, together with interest thereon made reimbursable under this act.

"SEC. 10. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provision of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given

to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. Consent is also given to the joinder of the United States as a party if suit is brought against any State or subdivision thereof because of the construction, operation or maintenance of any project constructed pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

"SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$421,270,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, some Members on the Republican side of the aisle said yesterday that they certainly felt that, since the lower basin had been given a great many advantages in the years gone by, it was entirely unfair to vote against the improvement of the upper basin. Therefore, I have offered a substitute which, I think, will more than amply take care of the upper basin.

You have had the proponents of this legislation tell you just how good it is, just how much it will pay back, even though they have formulas which have never before been used in any reclamation project. The proponents have figures which will extend it until your great grandchildren will never see the end of it, and they try to tell you it will not cause a drain upon the United States Treasury and that it will all be paid back.

They have come up with some fantastic figures and shown you some tremendous charts indicating that all this money that is going to be used will come out of the reclamation fund, and that some of the Western States produce it. This is the first time that I have ever known that the public lands in the Western States belonged to those Western States. I certainly believe it is about time, if that is the case, that some of the folks on my right change their tune about the giveaway, because they belong to the Western States. Therefore, since they belong to the Western States, my amendment is a bigger giveaway outside of foreign aid than anybody else has ever heard tell of.

This amendment offers to the for upper basin States the sum of \$421,270,000 from the United States Treasury without the upper basin States being obliged to pay back 1 penny. I do this because I do not believe this project will ever pay back 1 penny to the United States Treasury, so the cheapest thing for the United States to do is to give them an outright grant. This amendment provides that they can build without returning a cent all of the facilities that are necessary for the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam and the power facilities in conjunction with it.

This amendment further provides that you can take all of the revenues from here on into perpetuity that are to be produced by hydroelectric power, and build all of the facilities that each

of the upper basin States desire until they have the full utilization of the waters allocated to the upper basin. I am willing to accept the upper basin division of the revenues. Then they can build anything in the upper basin that they want to.

The one thing my amendment provides which they will not like, and which I say tests their sincerity, is that they cannot come back to the Treasury of the United States, they cannot come back to the Congress and ask for 1 more penny to develop the upper basin.

I defy anyone here to show, outside of foreign aid, where any State or States have received for reclamation such a proposition as I now offer, but I feel certain that, as I saw in the committee when I offered this same amendment, we will find united action by the upper basin saying "they do not want it."

They do not want it because they know the upper basin project is no good. They know that the industry feature cannot pay out. They know that they cannot even build Glen Canyon Dam. They know that all of the engineering features that have been talked about and the tremendous amount of engineering that has been done has been done at a place known as Mile Four or exactly 4 miles above Lee Ferry. And what the Bureau of Reclamation discovered there at Mile Four is that the type of strata that is found in that area is not sufficient upon which to build a dam. They cannot build a dam there so they moved up the Colorado River 11 miles. Now they are up to Mile Fifteen. It was only because some of the men down at the Bureau know that this project cannot be built and that they cannot build a high dam at Glen Canyon, they came to members of the committee and gave us these facts. Then we asked the Bureau of Reclamation, and they reluctantly admitted they could not build a dam at Mile Four. So, I tell you, my amendment challenges the good faith of the people of the upper basin to accept from the taxpayers of America the biggest gift ever given, and I feel certain that within a very short time you shall hear the representatives of the Upper Basin States stand up and tell you why they should not accept this gift.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. There is no doubt but that the gentleman's proposal would be a great saving to the Federal Government, but how does the gentleman expect that his proposal will be accepted by the Western States when, for instance, there is an implied agreement to come back to the Congress to appropriate something like \$5 million more for the Arizona Central irrigation project? That is all a part of this agreement. Now how do you expect the gentleman from the West to accept your very modest proposal?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am only applying this to the upper basin States. We defeated the central Arizona project a couple of years ago. I feel that if this goes through, both gentlemen from Ari-

zona should come forward and offer a new bill because if we are going to pass this bill, and if we are going to start this giveaway, then members of the Committee, we might as well give the whole thing away in the central Arizona project and the Frying Pan-Arkansas project.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is a very distinguished lawyer and a member of the Pennsylvania bar. I would like to ask the gentleman if he really believes that his amendment is constitutional?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that it is constitutional. If we can give money away to other nations, actually there is nothing in the Constitution that I know of that prevents the United States from giving to any four of the States of the Union amounts such as this.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman have any evidence, or does he really believe that Arizona has any ax to grind in this matter, or that this has anything really to do with the project in Arizona.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that Arizona has a lot to do with it. Arizona, in my opinion, has been negligent in its position in the past and I do not base that upon the gentleman's action, but from other people who have lived in that State.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that if the Government's claim for basic water rights for the Indians is upheld that the State of Arizona has more than a million acre feet estimated allotment to be given to Arizona under the basic Indian rights in addition to that which it already has under the pact?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So I would say to our friends from Arizona who beat their breasts and say, "We have nothing to gain from this contest," that they might be questioned on that point.

Mr. SAYLOR. I think they have a great deal to gain from this contest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

I suggest that this is the most disagreeable thing that has been presented before this body in connection with the debate on this bill. We do not ask for any handouts. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why some of the Members do not understand our desires and motives. They do not understand that we desire to pay our own way through our contribution to the Federal economy, the same as those other regions which have been developed.

The gentleman proposes that the Federal Government would give a grant of money which, compounded by the formula used by the gentleman from southern California, would amount to \$20 or \$30 billion in 100 years and in 200 years to the enormous sum of \$48 billion. The

West is not asking for that sort of Federal help in order to develop its contribution to the Federal economy.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman agree that the sole purpose of this amendment is to make this bill so bad that he hopes someone will vote it down?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from Utah understands the author of this bill, he will know that the author would vote against the bill if the substitute of the gentleman from Pennsylvania were adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to correct one misapprehension. Several misapprehensions have been created here today. The 1 million acre-feet of water which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] spoke about as coming to Arizona, of course he had reference to some possibility that might occur in a lawsuit of the State of Arizona versus the State of California. It was offered simply as a smokescreen. It has nothing to do with the merits of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course the gentleman knows that if the contention of Arizona is upheld it will affect the whole problem of the flow of the river, not only the water that will be impounded in the lower dam but the water that will be impounded in the upper dam, because that water will have to flow down to the Indians. It would have an effect on the compact. It would affect Arizona and all the other States involved.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman offered his previous bit of information as an effort to show there was some conspiracy between the States of the West. My only reason for taking the floor was to disabuse his mind of any possibility of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would not use the word "conspiracy." I recognize the right of the gentleman from Arizona to press his contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I know that the proponents and sponsors of this bill to build the Colorado River storage project are colleagues of mine

who are sincere in every way. Their purpose and their integrity are unquestioned. The distinguished gentlemen from Utah [Mr. Dawson and Dr. Dixon] and the distinguished gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall and Mr. Rogers] are estimable in every way. They are doing the thing they believe to be right in behalf of their own areas. I am sure that they are no less dedicated and high-minded than those who are opposed to this project.

Therefore, I trust that in these words which I am going to use, none of my colleagues will feel that I am transgressing the bounds of either friendship or legislative justification.

This House is now considering one of the most expensive but least economic water-resource projects ever acted on by any Congress. This is the proposed series of multipurpose dams and irrigation units in the upper Colorado River Basin, known as the Colorado River storage project.

The main concerted opposition to this project has come from two unrelated groups and for entirely different reasons. Water users in the lower Colorado River area, particularly those in California, oppose the project for fear it will cause a reduction in the Colorado River water supply available to them. Numerous conservation groups have voiced their opposition on the grounds that some construction would destroy the scenic beauty of Dinosaur National Monument. A part of this opposition apparently has been relieved by the elimination of a certain portion of the entire construction.

These are good reasons, I assume, why those two groups should be vitally interested in the construction of this project.

However, it seems to me that there are good reasons why people broadly as a group should question the wisdom of the Federal Government embarking on this project. These reasons are economic and I believe get broadly at the question of whether or not this is a matter in the best interests of the entire country. From all the facts I have obtained, there is no other public-power project in the history of this country that will be so expensive per unit of power as the upper Colorado.

The cost of producing current will be 4½ times as much as that produced on the Columbia River, and 3 to 4 times as much as the current produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senate bill called for a total expenditure of \$1,650,000,000. The House appropriation calls for roughly half that amount. However, even the proponents admit that the ultimate cost of this project must be approximately the outlay as set out by the Senate. It does not appear that this overall project can function without the various participating projects included in the Senate bill, but not included in the House bill. This merely means we are postponing the appropriation of approximately another \$800 million until such time as the additional projects become absolutely necessary.

In reading the Senate report, I find that the entire cost of the municipal-power feature of the project, plus interest during the construction and payout

period, will be returned to the Treasury. However, pursuant to reclamation law, no interest will be charged against irrigation costs. This interest will, of course, be a direct subsidy to the water users, paid for by the taxpayers. The cost of irrigation investment will be \$305 million in the administration's proposed project. The Department of the Interior computed that the interest over the 60-year period would be \$1,153,000,000. This calculation is at 2½ percent compounded annually and assumes a final payoff of construction costs for irrigation in the year 2032. This amount is \$335 million more than the construction cost of the entire project, including the hydroelectric and municipal water facilities as well as the irrigation, of course. If the upper Colorado project should be further expanded to include the 21 actually approved units as is contemplated in Senate 500, the construction costs of the irrigated units will be \$908 million. The interest which the Government would have to pay on that amount would total at least \$3,429,000,000 by the time the irrigated units are paid for by power revenues and water users.

From this you can see that the tremendous penalty is being paid for by the Federal Government in the form of interest in the ensuing 60 years.

EVENTUAL COST WILL PROBABLY BE MUCH HIGHER THAN NOW ESTIMATED

A report of a special subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee dated December 5, 1952, shows that the total cost of all Bureau of Reclamation projects, except the Missouri River Basin program, had increased 106 percent as of 1952 from the estimates originally submitted to Congress. The 1952 estimated cost of the Missouri Basin program had risen 274 percent from the figure used at the time it was approved by Congress. Similarly, the Department of the Interior figures show that 182 projects had increased in cost by 124 percent from the date they were originally considered by Congress.

Price changes accounted for about 30 percent of the increased cost of reclamation projects, while project modifications and other factors accounted for the balance.

POSSIBILITY OF PROJECT PAYING FOR ITSELF QUESTIONED

Suppose that the project can be built within the estimated cost, will this project pay for itself? If the power can be sold over the years at the relatively high cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar, it will take 78 years from the time construction is started to pay off all construction costs. This, of course, does not include interest.

The private electric companies in the upper Colorado River area have expressed a willingness to purchase power from the project to the extent that it is made available at costs reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs. However, in their statement, these electric companies made a reservation that says the upper Colorado River Basin "is one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world." Underground there are vast deposits of coal, great reservoirs of oil and natural gas, and mountains of oil shale and deposits of uranium ores.

The extent of these great resources for the production of thermal energy in the area is a sound reason in itself to question whether power from the upper Colorado project will be feasible some years hence when the development of these resources is increased.

DOES THE AGRICULTURE POTENTIAL WARRANT THE IRRIGATION EXPENSE?

The projects actually authorized in the Senate bill would provide water for 132,360 acres of new land and would supplement 250,330 acres of irrigated land for a total irrigated acreage of 382,690. The \$378 million construction cost of the irrigation facilities indicates an average cost of \$952 per acre. This, of course, is without interest. If the ultimate interest cost of \$1,428 million on the irrigation investment is added to the construction cost, the average cost per acre becomes \$2,142.

There are 12 authorized participating projects in the Colorado River storage project as passed in S. 500. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre for irrigated land in the 12 authorized projects be printed in the Record:

Project	New land irrigated (acres)	Supplemental land (acres)		Total acres irrigated (2 plus 3)	Total acres irrigated equivalent new land (2 plus 4)	Construction costs allocated to irrigation (report, p. 187)	Average project cost per acre (report, p. 187)	Cost per acre on equivalent new land acre basis
		Actual	New land equivalent					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. LaBarge.....	7,970	-----	-----	7,970	7,970	\$1,673,300	\$210	\$210
2. Seedskadee.....	60,720	-----	-----	60,720	60,720	23,272,000	383	383
3. Lyman.....	-----	40,600	13,533	40,600	13,533	10,564,000	260	780
4. Silt.....	1,900	5,400	1,800	7,300	3,700	3,282,400	450	887
5. Smith Fork.....	2,270	8,160	2,720	10,430	4,990	3,343,000	321	670
6. Paonia.....	2,210	14,830	4,943	17,040	7,153	6,791,600	398	949
7. Florida.....	6,300	12,650	4,217	18,950	10,517	6,503,600	343	618
8. Pine River project extension.....	15,150	-----	-----	15,150	15,150	5,027,000	332	332
9. Emory County.....	3,630	20,450	6,817	24,080	10,447	9,636,500	400	922
10. Central Utah.....	28,540	131,840	43,947	160,380	72,487	127,354,000	794	1,757
11. Hammond.....	3,670	-----	-----	3,670	3,670	2,302,000	627	627
12. Gooseberry.....	-----	16,400	5,467	16,400	5,467	5,727,500	349	1,047
Total.....	132,360	250,330	83,444	382,690	215,804	205,476,900	537	952

Mr. Chairman, this is the cost without adding any interest. The interest cost which will be borne by the Federal Gov-

ernment should be added to the cost of principal. I am applying the ratio of 1.25 for interest in order to be as fair

as possible to the sponsors of this project. The construction cost is estimated for 10 years. The period of no interest is 10, plus 10, plus 50—or 70 years. If the interest is added, the cost of the irrigation of the authorized participating projects is as follows:

For the LaBarge project, \$472 an acre.
For the Seedskaadee project, \$861 an acre.

For the Lyman project, \$1,755 an acre.
For the Silt project, \$1,995 an acre.
For the Smith Fork project, \$1,507 an acre.

For the Paonia project, \$2,135 an acre.
For the Florida project, \$1,490 an acre.
For the Pine River project extension, \$747 an acre.

For the Emery County project, \$2,074 an acre.

For the Central Utah project, \$3,953 an acre.

For the Hammond project, \$1,411 an acre.

For the Gooseberry project, \$2,355 an acre.

The grand average for the 12 projects is \$2,142 an acre.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to insert a table showing the cost per acre of the irrigated land projects, including interest, in these 12 projects. I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

La Barge.....	\$210×1.25=	\$262.50+	\$210=	\$472.50
Seedskaadee.....	383×1.25=	478.75+	383=	861.75
Lyman.....	780×1.25=	975.00+	780=	1,755.00
Silt.....	887×1.25=	1,108.75+	887=	1,995.75
Smith Fork.....	670×1.25=	837.50+	670=	1,507.50
Paonia.....	949×1.25=	1,186.25+	949=	2,135.25
Florida.....	618×1.25=	872.50+	618=	1,490.50
Pine River project extension.....	332×1.25=	415.00+	332=	747.00
Emery County.....	922×1.25=	1,152.50+	922=	2,074.50
Central Utah.....	1,757×1.25=	2,196.25+	1,757=	3,953.25
Hammond.....	627×1.25=	783.75+	627=	1,410.75
Gooseberry.....	1,047×1.25=	1,308.75+	1,047=	2,355.75
Total.....	952×1.25=	1,190.00+	952=	2,142.00

I come from the State of Illinois. This is a rich agricultural area—especially through the middle portion of the State. Some of it is the most fertile land in the world. I have not heard of any land selling for more than \$700 per acre.

The national average value per acre for farm land, including farm buildings, was \$78.81 in March 1955, according to the United States Department of Agri-

culture. The Department statistics also show that about 20 million acres of presently unused lands east of the Rocky Mountain Plateau area can be reclaimed for a fraction of what it would cost per acre in the upper Colorado River basin.

I believe that all of the proposed irrigation projects are at an altitude greater than 1 mile. The one in Wyoming is as high as 7,500 feet. The winters there are long and cold and the growing season is quite short.

Based upon the above estimates the cost of this project to the people of the State of Illinois would be \$261,975,600. This would, of course, include cost of construction and interest. This would represent a cost of about \$170 per family to the people of the State of Illinois. A further breakdown indicates that the cost for each 150-acre farm irrigated through this project would be about \$321,300.

Mr. Chairman, I herewith insert a table showing the cost to the individual States in the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500:

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500

	Per- cent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated			Per- cent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construc- tion	Cost of interest on construc- tion allo- cated to irrigation	Cost of project construc- tion	Cost of interest on construc- tion allo- cated to irrigation			Cost of project construc- tion	Cost of interest on construc- tion allo- cated to irrigation	Cost of project construc- tion	Cost of interest on construc- tion allo- cated to irrigation
Alabama.....	0.93	\$10,164,900	\$13,280,400	\$15,354,300	\$31,889,700	New Hampshire.....	0.27	\$2,951,100	\$3,855,600	\$4,457,700	\$9,258,300
Arizona.....	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900	New Jersey.....	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
Arkansas.....	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200	New Mexico.....	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
California.....	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800	New York.....	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
Colorado.....	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900	North Carolina.....	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
Connecticut.....	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200	North Dakota.....	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Delaware.....	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000	Ohio.....	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Florida.....	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300	Oklahoma.....	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Georgia.....	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000	Oregon.....	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Idaho.....	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400	Pennsylvania.....	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Illinois.....	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600	Rhode Island.....	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
Indiana.....	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500	South Carolina.....	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
Iowa.....	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900	South Dakota.....	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Kansas.....	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300	Tennessee.....	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Kentucky.....	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900	Texas.....	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Louisiana.....	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100	Utah.....	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Maine.....	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200	Vermont.....	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Maryland.....	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500	Virginia.....	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Massachusetts.....	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700	Washington.....	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
Michigan.....	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200	West Virginia.....	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Minnesota.....	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200	Wisconsin.....	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Mississippi.....	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400	Wyoming.....	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
Missouri.....	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200	District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Montana.....	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900						
Nebraska.....	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700						
Nevada.....	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400						
						Total.....	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

You will note that in all my figures I am using the cost as allocated and set up in S. 500 rather than in the House bill. I have not found anyone yet who consistently states to me that the House project as set up will be feasible. In my opinion, if the Colorado River storage project is to be feasible and workable, it will be necessary to have the connecting projects set out in the Senate bill. This merely means we will be making supplemental appropriations for these projects until such time as the total cost reaches that set out in S. 500.

May I say to my colleagues, it is true small portions of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming will benefit from the passage of this bill. These areas would receive 100 percent

of the benefits of the proposed project. However, the four States combined would pay less than 2 percent of the added national tax burden. The taxpayers of the other 44 States would have to pay the balance, but would derive no benefits from the project itself.

The House bill which is being heard at this time will call for an expenditure of approximately one-half the amount which passed the Senate last year. However, it does not seem that any disguise of a smaller appropriation could make the project more palatable than the one passed by the Senate. This reduction alone will not transform the true character, nor revise the present cost aspects of the upper Colorado River storage project.

IS THIS PROJECT IN KEEPING WITH GOOD PUBLIC POLICY?

The policy set out by this bill appears to me to be one almost directly opposite to the present public policy of the Department of Agriculture insofar as production acres are concerned. When this irrigation project is completed there will be added approximately 400,000 acres to the productive capacity of the agricultural plant of the United States. A few days ago, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before both the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture seeking approval of a far-reaching plan to remove somewhere between 20 and 40 million acres from the productive capacity of our agricultural plant. It is an impossibility for me to describe the op-

posite directions in which apparently we are going by such a plan as is proposed in the Colorado River storage project on irrigated productive acres.

In addition, how can we justify to the general public the additional acreage provided in this project at such enormous cost per acre as \$2,355 an acre for the Gooseberry project, \$3,593 an acre for the central Utah project, and a grand average for the 12 projects of \$2,142 an acre? I realize that in many instances the Congress is forced to do things of which some people back home would not approve—all in the best interests of the entire country. However, I am asking at this time, if your people back home could have heard all of the debate thus far on this project, both for and against, how many votes do you think this project would receive from the people in your district? I believe I am conservative in saying that if all of the information were available to the general public that has been made available to me in this debate, this project would not receive the approval of 5 out of 100 people in the 22d Congressional District of Illinois. In talking with many other Congressmen, I believe their reaction has been almost the same as mine as to how people generally would feel about this project.

For the reasons which I have outlined, it appears to me that this project is not broadly in the interest of the United States, and for that reason it should not be enacted into law.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does not the gentleman suppose the same thing would be true as to flood-control projects in Ohio in my district?

Is it not occasionally better for some of us to perhaps vote for what we consider the need of the whole country rather than that of some people in our district?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. I think that is a fair statement of the gentleman from Utah. I will say that you gentlemen are worthy and your integrity is not in question. You stand for what you think is right. So do I. In this particular instance I do not believe this project is in the best interest of all of the country. That is just my own opinion based on the benefits to be received on the amount of money that is to be spent.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does not the gentleman feel that the President of the United States is in a very good position to know the overall picture of this? Does not the gentleman give some credit to the President's opinion as expressed in his endorsement of yesterday?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. It is a difficult thing to find myself at variance with my leader. I hate to have to disagree with him, on this project. I believe I have disagreed with him on three major issues in 3 years. I do disagree with him on this. I could not in good conscience support this project.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And is not the administration sponsoring a soil-fertility bank at the same time?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but I do not know what connection that has with this.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman himself just mentioned that we were putting land into production.

Mr. SPRINGER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to the committee amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending substitute amendment and all amendments thereto end in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California advise me if that will give me at least 3 minutes?

Mr. ENGLE. I included the gentleman in my computation of time.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. I had included the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I will amend my request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes following the time allotted to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I said in the opening days of this debate that the proponents of this legislation would show:

First. That it has bipartisan support. I am sure all of my colleagues recognize that this is now true. Incidentally, it also has bipartisan opposition. That opposition in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was 20 to 5. The proponents carried the bill in the other body by a vote of almost 2 to 1.

Second. I promised to show the project had engineering feasibility. The opponents are attacking the feasibility and the capability of the engineers. The same engineers and department planned the Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams. They planned the great Imperial Irrigation District. Years of exhaustive work has shown the project to be feasible. The chinle's rocks hoax has proven

to be a Barnum & Bailey believe-it-or-not show. The chinle's rock is 700 feet below the base of the dam. My colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] demonstrated to you that the chinle's rock as it appears in nature is no obstacle to the building of this dam. It does not dissolve in water as easily as opponents would want you to believe.

Third. I promised to show that it was economically feasible. More than two-thirds of the project repays all the money, with interest. There is a very small amount of flood control, all non-reimbursable funds. Economists have proven feasibility.

Fourth. We have shown that the so-called tax map has been a phoney. That the Tax Foundation of New York and Washington denied having anything to do with it. It was prepared by the Colorado River Association, with which the Tax Foundation has no connection. The foundation did not prepare these figures, which were prepared and published without their consent.

Fifth. Now as to surplus crops the committee will accept an amendment which handles those who worry about surplus crops. In fact very little surplus crops come from federally irrigated land.

Sixth. We have shown that the Indians will receive some direct help because it provides labor, it provides better economy.

Seventh. We have shown that the project will not cost from \$4 to \$8 billion as proclaimed by the opponents, but less than \$800 million as indicated in this bill.

Eighth. We have shown that it does not irrigate 583,000 acres as the southern California lobby would make you believe, but approximately 132,000 acres of new land.

We have tried to show, my colleagues, that the Colorado River storage project is a well planned, economically sound water development project for a semi-desert portion of the country which needs water for various purposes. The project has been planned to reimburse through revenue from water and power which will be used and paid for by the residents of that area. Two-thirds of it at full interest and to meet the cost of operation and maintenance.

I am sure any objective legislator will recognize that the southern California water lobby stands to profit by millions of dollars if they succeed in defeating and delaying the developing of the four upper basin States water and power that was allocated to them in a solemn interstate compact effected nearly 25 years ago.

Ninth. We have shown that California will not lose one bucketful of water. In fact, it seems to me that by storing the water in these reservoirs, that the Southern States would be more assured of a water supply because the dams would hold back excess water that now runs to the Gulf of California, without being stored or used. With the water properly stored, it would assure the Southern States of the amount of water promised to them under the basin compact.

I trust, my colleagues, you will not be looking just at the effects of this project

as of today, but thinking in terms of two hundred to three hundred million people who will be living in this country by the time this project is completed. They will need homes, jobs; and they will need food.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for conducting what I consider to be some of the most impartial hearings I have ever had the privilege of sitting in on. As a matter of fact, he gave the opposition equal time on every occasion. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the chairman of the subcommittee have been fair in every respect and certainly have the respect and high regard of every member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and his committee have sold me on this bill. When this debate started I was inclined against it. Now I am supporting it.

I have been studying the voluminous material for and against this bill that has been pouring into my office. The statements of basic facts as to costs, feasibility, and so forth, have varied so widely that I have wondered whether the proponents and opponents were talking about the same project.

It turns out that this is no \$4 billion project, but authorizes \$760 million for a comprehensive plan for storing water for the upper basin of the Colorado River that will take many years to complete and will be 99 percent reimbursable as to principal and interest, except for the irrigation expenditure where principal alone is repayable, according to reclamation principles established since the time of President Theodore Roosevelt. Over half of the area of the four States is federally owned. The reclamation fund, during the 19 years of completion of the irrigation project, will take in from these 4 States in mineral royalties, sales, and leases, \$150 million more than the \$287 million to be spent on irrigation. Water is gold for these four States in the upper Colorado Basin. The lower States, especially California, have gotten their share of Colorado River water through Hoover Dam and the other great Federal works. Under the seven-State compact, which is basic to this bill, the upper-basin States should now have a chance to store and use their share of the water.

In addition to electric power and municipal water use, irrigation will ultimately reclaim about 131,000 acres. We do not need these acres now, when we are talking of a soil bank. They will not be reclaimed now. They will be reclaimed over a period of 19 years or more. By that time our growing population will need those acres. By the amendment we adopted they cannot be

used for raising crops in surplus for 10 years. By that time we will probably need whatever they can produce.

The more I learn of the possibilities of this project the more I appreciate why three Presidents and their administrations have backed it, why it is a part of President Eisenhower's program that he has urged in the last few days.

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. VORYS asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, in speaking in opposition to the substitute I want to point out that until the substitute was offered all of the revenues went into a basin fund out of which all of the expenses were paid. I want you to be sure you understand the substitute changes that situation; that all of the revenues go into a fund, the amount of moneys in the fund are split up in accordance with the allocation of water between these States, which makes a considerable difference in the ability of the projects to pay back because some of the authorized projects are not in monetary proportion to the allocation of water. Based on that, even assuming you could sell power for 6 mills for the next hundred years, I have here a calculation which shows that the deficit for Utah would amount to \$82 million for the hundred years, for Wyoming the sum of \$13 million, although there would be surpluses for Colorado and New Mexico.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3383. There have been many good reasons expressed here today why the upper Colorado bill is unsound and should not be passed. I wish to add my voice to this opposition and point out one particular phase of the legislation which is a good example of the bill's general unsoundness.

The legislation contains a provision for a project for the benefit of Navaho Indians in New Mexico. Whenever any aid is proposed for the Navahos, it is always greeted with rejoicing because of the poor conditions under which they live.

The bill we are debating would provide irrigated farms for some 1,100 Navaho Indian families at a cost per farm of \$200,000 according to witnesses from the Bureau of Indian Affairs who testified on the subject. These witnesses stated that the gross income per family farm would be about \$5,000 a year. It is easy to see that the interest charges alone on this investment of \$200,000 per farm would, at 2½ percent, equal the gross farm income. It seems to me that less expensive methods could be found to provide for these Indians. We constantly urge that it is not in the best interest of Indians to hold them in a second class citizenship status but in this bill we are providing a Government dole of \$200,000 per farm for which all Americans will have to pay. Testimony at the committee hearings was also adduced to the effect that there is grave doubt as to whether the Indians want to farm irrigated land or whether they could succeed as farmers of such irrigated land.

I urge all present to defeat this extravagant legislation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a fundamental question. It is a question whether we can in all good conscience pour out the taxpayers' money entrusted to us for a proposition that has never become clear.

I include in the RECORD a quotation from Raymond Moley's Case Against Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects:

A TRUE PARTNERSHIP

There is a strange claim by some proponents of the Colorado River storage project that they are supporting a partnership plan such as has been advanced as an administration policy in the Northwest. There is no resemblance at all. The party of the first part, the Federal Government, is paying for the entire project and is constructing it. The parties of the second part supply the arid land. I favor, with the President's Cabinet Committee and with the earlier report of the Hoover Commission, a true sharing of the responsibilities in this project.

I have never contended and do not contend now that the four States in the upper basin are not entitled to the share of the water of the Colorado and its tributaries which was specified in the Colorado River Compact. Nor do I deny that the Federal Government should build the means to store that water, when needed. For the Federal Government by long prescription has assumed the responsibility of regulating the flow of interstate rivers. But this does not mean that the Government should build huge storage dams unless and until needed for water conservation and regulation.

Beyond that, I do not believe the Federal Government has an obligation. The power companies of the region which offered their testimony to the effect that there was a market—at a price—for the power should finance the power aspects of the storage dams themselves and dispose of the power where such storage dams can be justified. That is exactly what the Eisenhower-McKay partnership policy means, as illustrated by the proposed John Day Dam on the Columbia River.

Moreover, those cities which are in need of water for domestic purposes should provide the means of getting the water from the storage reservoirs. Finally, those industrial companies which are in the area and which are now so eagerly seeking subsidized water, should provide the means of getting the water for themselves. In short, the Federal Government should provide storage for the water as needed, and the users should go and get it. This would be true of the irrigators who are in need of supplementary supplies and those people—unnamed—who are anxious to try their fortunes on new irrigated land. This could be done through the States concerned if—and this if it is very large indeed—the bestowal of water will indeed produce the wealth which proponents of this project claim. So far as the Navaho Indians are concerned, surely a Government which has been engaged for a century or more in caring for and regulating the life of these natives can provide a less expensive way to make them self-reliant than to set them up on farms at a cost to the taxpayer of \$200,000 a family.

THE ISSUE IN MORALS AND EQUITY

If the issue were a simple matter of taking from rich States and giving to poor States, there might be a case despite the financial, engineering, and economic factors which I have mentioned. But these are not needy States. Their potential wealth is considerable, and their well-being is reflected in all that they pay for the benefit of the outside world. On the basis of per-capita income, they rank with the average among the States.

There is, moreover, a final consideration. It can be shown that the propaganda of the Federal Government for reclamation has in innumerable cases imposed a cruel hoax upon the farmers who attempt to cultivate the land. Indeed, the progressive lengthening of the payment period from 10 years in 1902 to 20 years in 1914 to 40 years in 1926 to 50 years in 1939 has been in response to the cries of distress of the unfortunate farmers and their congressional representatives. Since I have been writing about this subject over the past 2 years, I have received pathetic letters from farmers whose state of affairs has progressively turned to the worse. Despite the immense amount per acre that it takes to put water on arid land, the cultivation of that land and the management of the irrigation itself is a heavy burden upon the farmer. It is time to play fair with these farmers, as well as with the taxpayers of the 44 States in whose interest this discussion of the Colorado River storage project has been written.

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has had a very fine debate in the last several days and quite in conformity with the historic traditions of the House. We have been debating a problem that is not new to America. There is nothing new or revolutionary about what is proposed here today.

Conservation of water, reclamation, and irrigation are all topics that have been before the American people constantly since they were strenuously advocated by Theodore Roosevelt. We have a right as a nation to conserve the water of our country; we have a right to protect the people of the country from water shortages and from damages through water. These are related functions of the Federal Government. A nation without vision perishes. We must have vision if we are going to go forward to the destiny which I believe will be that of the American Republic. This projects the vision of a people who are planning for a better future.

Now let us look at the bill that we have before us today, a bill that I believe is going to be an important factor in the upbuilding of 4 or 5 of the great States of the Union. And, may I say here that merely relying on the opposition to a proposal by a single State is not well founded. The common good must come first. We are all citizens of this one country; we are all part of the United States of America. No part of the country can be benefited without all the rest of the country sharing in the benefits. We are all here together in America; we go up together or we will go down together. Let us plan to go up together.

This particular measure has had a great deal of opposition in the past. I want to repeat that there is no Echo Park Dam in this legislation. That legislation has been removed, and we have the promise of the managers on the part of the House they will not permit

it to be reinserted. And certainly those of us who are here have the power of veto if for any reason it should be reinserted. I mean by that, to vote down that conference report when it comes here, and I am confident that would be the verdict. Therefore, we need not fear that Echo Dam will be inserted in the conference report.

The cost of this project is small when you consider the tremendous value that will come out of it. Only 1 percent of the building cost is nonreimbursable. There is no interest in the reclamation part of the bill, as is the case in all reclamation projects. There is no heavy drain upon a country. Most of the expenditure will eventually come back to the Treasury, and we will have reclaimed a great national asset.

And let me comment right here and say to those who fear the further accentuation of the problem of surpluses that this will not happen. We have written into this bill an amendment which says that no new land may be brought into cultivation within 10 years, and there are those who believe that in the normal course of events it will take at least 20 years before new land can come into cultivation. This eliminates any immediate effect upon surpluses. My friends, may I say that while we are troubled with surpluses now our country is going forward in the future with such tremendous leaps and bounds in population the time may well come when we will want more land in cultivation so that we can feed the population who dwell in the great cities. This could be farsighted planning without any immediate harm.

One word more. This is an integral part of the program of President Eisenhower. It is part of the program that is dear to his heart, a part of the essential program that he seeks for the American people. In conclusion, let us not forget that in passing this resolution we enact legislation that will be of tremendous benefit to the four States who need a little shot in the arm from the Government so that they can face the future with hope and anticipation. You hear some talk about the workingman not sharing in this investment. Why, my friends, the money that will go for the purchase of machinery, tools, and equipment is not confined to any one State of the Union. All 48 States will in some way benefit by this program. I repeat, we all benefit by the starting of this great conservation program.

To my Republican friends I want to particularly ask that you support the President of the United States. He has given a program to the American people. This is part of his program, and we should give him a fair chance to fulfill his desire. Let us give these Mountain States a chance to live, and let us uphold the proposal of the President of the United States.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of 1 of the 44 States not receiving any direct benefit from the upper Colorado River project, I want to take this opportunity to explain my vote

in support of this legislation which I deem of vital importance to all America.

Although I have been elected from 1 of 23 congressional districts in Ohio, I do not believe I was sent to Washington to support projects and legislation which would be of tangible value and usefulness only to the people of my district. While the immediate needs of the people of my district are vitally important, I know that they would be anxious to support national projects which are vitally important to the Nation as a whole. The people of my community know full well that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway improvements are of direct benefit only to those States which abut the Great Lakes, and that tremendous sums of money have been appropriated over the years by Congress for the improvement of the Great Lakes seaway system. This legislation of necessity was supported by communities remote and distant from any direct advantage.

I support the Colorado River storage project because it is an important national improvement. The legislation as now designed eliminates any damage or interference with our national park system. The improvement will open a large four-State area for agriculture, comfortable habitation, and more efficient mining and industry. True, some industry and some people may be lured from Ohio and perhaps the community which I represent to make their homes in this newly developed area, but this area is just as much America as the precincts which I represent. Water, power, and a wholly changed landscape in the four affected States will enrich and improve the American productive plant. To complain about the threat this new productive area will become to other producing areas of agricultural or industrial products would be a narrow, provincial and an un-American viewpoint.

Although it is true that the new land to be developed by the project would be high-altitude land and therefore of limited agricultural value, it would nevertheless be usable land, producing grains and forage crops. Today, in view of our agricultural surplus and the proposal to retire excessive lands in a land bank, there is considerable criticism of developing new agricultural land when the country abounds in agricultural surpluses. It is my opinion that the current agricultural surpluses are a temporary condition which could radically change, particularly in view of the drastic increase in our population and the tremendous migration of people from rural areas to urban centers.

To create an abundance of agricultural products is to be provident. To create an abundance of agricultural land in a growing Nation is to be provident. If we should risk error, it seems to me that the risk should be made on the side of providence rather than improvidence. There is a greater security in an economy of abundance than any other I know about.

Personally, I believe fresh water to be America's most prized natural resource. In this bountiful land, I believe it not

only wasteful but almost sinful to permit lifegiving fresh water to evaporate on the sands of the desert or find its way to the sea. In our times we may yet see projects to accumulate, save, and distribute the tremendous fresh waters of our Great Lakes for agricultural as well as industrial production. With a proper distribution of the fresh water reserves of America, the whole face of the continent may be changed and with it the entire climate of the Nation might be affected. With the tremendous contemplated increase in human life, there must naturally be an increase in animal and vegetable life. Almost as important, there must be a comparable development of habitable space. While our people are becoming more and more urban, they have not lost their respect for open space and the average family has manifested its desire for the convenience and the comfort of urban living on a 2-acre parcel. The newly developed lands of the Colorado Basin in this project will provide space in which more Americans may have comfortable living. This new space will contribute in a great measure to lessening the pressures in our cities and urban communities. America is vast but its people have spread to all of its boundaries. The pressure of growing populations on habitable soil is increasing throughout the world. Under our democratic system and in view of the principles in which we believe, we cannot spread our people into the lands of other nations. Our only alternative in the democratic way is to make America larger by developing the land within our own boundaries.

The cost of this project is great and certainly is more costly than numerous other reclamation projects which have preceded it. It is in the recognition of this point that earlier reclamation projects have preceded this one. It is national experience that the cost of these improvement projects goes ever upward. If therefore this Colorado River project is for the good of all America, it is in the interest of economy that we undertake it at the earliest practicable date rather than defer it to a higher-cost period.

So therefore, when I support this great and important project with my vote today, I do so not only for the people who live in my district today but for their successors who may be dependent upon the resources of this great area for their national defense, for minerals, for agricultural products or perhaps for open living space. I cast this vote looking ahead for those who must follow us on this shrinking land on which we live. I support this important project not only for the food that this new land can provide or its minerals or the products of the industry that may develop, but also for the space land which people will require in comfortable modern life.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentlemen on this committee and those in charge of this bill, especially the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for their careful study of this measure. These two men have been fair, patient, honest, and very considerate in all of the

hearings, not only on this important matter but all others.

These gentlemen and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and other members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee assisted us in securing passage of the Washita Basin Improvement Association project. We Oklahoma Members desiring to be helpful in this instance, have enlisted the support of several other Members for this Colorado project in appreciation of the favors extended us.

We urge a favorable vote on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 311, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting]. One hundred and seventy-two Members are present; not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 136, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS 256

Adair	Beamer	Burdick
Addonizio	Becker	Byrne, Pa.
Albert	Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.
Andersen,	Bennett, Mich.	Canfield
H. Carl	Bentley	Cannon
Andresen,	Berry	Carnahan
August H.	Blatnik	Cederberg
Andrews	Boggs	Celler
Arends	Boland	Chenoweth
Aspinall	Bolling	Chilperfield
Auchincloss	Bolton,	Christopher
Avery	Frances P.	Chudoff
Ayres	Bosch	Clark
Baker	Brooks, La.	Cole
Baldwin	Brooks, Tex.	Coon
Barrett	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Bass, Tenn.	Broyhill	Coudert
Bates	Buckley	Cramer

Cretella	Karsten	Rhodes, Ariz.
Crumpacker	Kearney	Rhodes, Pa.
Cunningham	Kearns	Richards
Curtis, Mass.	Keating	Riehlman
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rivers
Davidson	Keogh	Roberts
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Robison, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Rodino
Dawson, Utah	Kilgore	Rogers, Colo.
Deane	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Delaney	Krueger	Rogers, Tex.
Dempsey	Landrum	Rooney
Diggs	Lane	Rutherford
Dingell	Lanham	Sadlak
Dixon	Lankford	St. George
Dodd	Latham	Schwengel
Dollinger	LeCompte	Scott
Dolliver	Lesinski	Scudder
Dondero	Long	Seely-Brown
Donohue	Lovre	Selden
Dorn, S. C.	McCarthy	Sheehan
Edmondson	McConnell	Shelley
Elliott	McCormack	Short
Ellsworth	McGregor	Sieminski
Engle	Macdonald	Siler
Evins	Machrowicz	Simpson, Pa.
Felghan	Mack, Wash.	Sisk
Fernandez	Magnuson	Smith, Kans.
Fisher	Marshall	Smith, Miss.
Fjare	Martin	Smith, Wis.
Flood	Meador	Steed
Fogarty	Morrow	Sullivan
Forand	Metcalf	Talle
Ford	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Forrester	Miller, Md.	Thomas
Frazier	Miller, Nebr.	Thompson, La.
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Thompson, N. J.
Gathings	Mills	Thomson, Wyo.
George	Minshall	Thornberry
Gordon	Morano	Trimble
Grant	Morgan	Tumulty
Green, Pa.	Morrison	Udall
Griffiths	Moss	Vanik
Gubser	Moulder	Velde
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Vinson
Harris	Natcher	Vorys
Harvey	Nicholson	Vursell
Hays, Ark.	Norblad	Wainwright
Hayworth	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Healey	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Hébert	O'Hara, Minn.	Westland
Heseltun	O'Neill	Wickersham
Hill	Ostertag	Widnall
Hoeven	Passman	Wier
Hoffman, Ill.	Patman	Wigglesworth
Holland	Patterson	Williams, N. J.
Holmes	Pelly	Williams, N. Y.
Holtzman	Perkins	Willis
Hope	Pfost	Withrow
Horan	Philbin	Wolcott
Hyde	Pilcher	Wolverton
Ikard	Powell	Wright
Jarman	Price	Yates
Jenkins	Quigley	Young
Jensen	Radwan	Younger
Johnson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.	Zablocki
Johnson, Wis.	Reed, N. Y.	Zelenko
Jones, Ala.	Rees, Kans.	
Judd	Reuss	

NAYS 136

Abbitt	Davis, Wis.	Holifield
Abernethy	Devereux	Holt
Alexander	Dies	Hosmer
Alger	Dorn, N. Y.	Huddleston
Allen, Calif.	Dowdy	Hull
Allen, Ill.	Doyle	Jackson
Ashley	Durham	James
Ashmore	Fallon	Jennings
Barden	Fascell	Johansen
Bass, N. H.	Fenton	Jonas
Baumhart	Fino	Jones, Mo.
Bennett, Fla.	Flynt	Jones, N. C.
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Kean
Bolton,	Friedel	King, Calif.
Oliver P.	Garmatz	Kluczynski
Bonner	Gary	Knox
Bow	Gavlin	Laird
Boyle	Gentry	Lipscomb
Bray	Green, Oreg.	McCulloch
Brown, Ohio	Gross	McDonough
Brownson	Gwinn	McIntire
Budge	Hagen	McMillan
Burleson	Hale	McVey
Bush	Haley	Mack, Ill.
Carlyle	Hand	Madden
Carrigg	Harden	Mahon
Chase	Hardy	Maillard
Chelf	Harrison, Nebr.	Mason
Church	Harrison, Va.	Matthews
Clevenger	Henderson	Mumma
Cole	Herlong	Murray, Ill.
Coon	Hess	Norrell
Cooper	Hiestand	O'Hara, Ill.
Corbett	Hinsaw	O'Konski
Coudert	Hoffman, Mich.	Osmer
Cramer		

Phillips	Roosevelt	Taber
Pillion	Saylor	Teague, Calif.
Poage	Schenck	Teague, Tex.
Poff	Scherer	Thompson,
Polk	Sheppard	Mich.
Prouty	Shuford	Utt
Rabaut	Sikes	Van Zandt
Ray	Simpson, III.	Williams, Miss.
Riley	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Calif.
Robeson,	Spence	Wilson, Ind.
Rogers, Fla.	Springer	Winstead

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1

Van Pelt

NOT VOTING 40

Anfuso	Gamble	Nelson
Bailey	Granahan	Preston
Bell	Gray	Priest
Blitch	Gregory	Rains
Bowler	Hays, Ohio	Scrivner
Boykin	Hillings	Staggers
Burnside	Kee	Thompson, Tex.
Byrd	Kelley, Pa.	Tollefson
Chatham	King, Pa.	Tuck
Denton	Klein	Watts
Derounian	Knutson	Wharton
Donovan	McDowell	Whitten
Eberharter	Mollohan	
Fountain	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bell for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Burnside against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Byrd against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mrs. Knutson against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. King of Pennsylvania against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Gable.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DEROUNIAN. Were he present, he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BUDGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 500, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substi-

tute the language of the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 500 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 3383, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 3383 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS
APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to one-half hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and one-half by me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9536, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation bill containing appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for 14 Government agencies. The total amount appropriated in this bill is \$14,849,275.

This bill contains an appropriation for the salary of the President of the United States which is, by law, fixed at \$150,000; for expenses necessary for the White House Office, the amount of \$1,875,000; for expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the President in connection with special projects the amount of \$1,500,000.

This fund is used by the President for staff assistance on special problems which arise from time to time but cannot be considered the responsibility of an existing agency. Examples of the type of staff assistance provided during the

current year are projects on disarmament, coordination of public works planning, and the coordination of foreign economic policy.

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, the subcommittee has allowed \$383,775. These funds provide for the care, maintenance, and operation of the Executive Mansion and the surrounding grounds.

It might be of interest to the committee to know that the electric bill for power used in the White House is \$30,890 per year; that there are 72 permanent employees at the White House; that last year there were over 600,000 visitors in the White House, and during last year the White House was closed for a period of 6 weeks; that in 1954 there were 826,843 visitors and that the White House is now open to visitors 5 days a week from 10 a. m., to 12 noon, Tuesdays through Saturdays, and that approximately 8,000 visitors per day pass through the White House.

We have appropriations in this bill of \$3,550,000 for the Bureau of the Budget, which is a slight decrease of \$9,000 from the budget request. The Bureau assists the President in the discharge of his budgetary, management, and other executive responsibilities. The appropriation requested for 1957, together with estimated reimbursements, will support a total of 419 positions. This is 4 less than the number estimated for 1956, 16 less than for 1955. We were told during the current fiscal year the Bureau has continued to carry a heavy workload, which is not expected to grow lighter in the coming fiscal year.

For the Council of Economic Advisers the committee has allowed \$350,000, which is \$15,700 less than the budget request. The Council of Economic Advisers analyzes the national economy and its various segments; advises the President on economic developments; recommends policies for economic growth and stability; appraises economic programs and policies of the Federal Government; and assists in preparation of the annual economic report of the President to Congress.

In the opinion of this committee the National Security Council is one of the most important agencies of the Government. The Council advises the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security. The Central Intelligence Agency is under the direction of the Council. The Council includes the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Other high officials attend meetings or participate in Council actions as directed by the President.

The Council staff performs analysis, review functions for the Council and otherwise assists the Council in bringing about policy coordination. For this agency this committee has appropriated

the full budget request of \$248,000, which is \$8,000 above the amount appropriated for 1956.

Appropriations for the Office of Defense Mobilization are included in this bill. The Office of Defense Mobilization directs and plans the nonmilitary mobilization effort and coordinates all mobilization activities of the executive branch of the Government. These activities include production, manpower, stabilization, transportation, telecommunications, and the stockpiling of strategic materials. It was comforting to the members of our subcommittee to learn that our stockpile program is in excellent condition from an overall standpoint, and that only a few items remain on the critical list. For this agency the committee has appropriated \$2,200,000, which is \$25,000 more than the 1956 appropriation but \$83,000 less than the budget request.

For the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, the committee has allowed the sum of \$57,500, which is \$2,500 less than the 1956 appropriations and \$2,500 less than the budget request for 1957. The President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization advises the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the identification of major organizational and management problems and the development of proposed corrective actions by means of reorganization plans for submission to Congress, Executive orders, and other administrative actions.

For the Emergency Fund for the President, we have provided \$1 million, which is the amount that was appropriated for this fund in 1956. These funds are to enable the President to provide for emergencies affecting the national interest, security or defense. As of February 15, 1956, when the Director of the Bureau of the Budget appeared before our committee to justify this request, no part of the fund appropriated for 1956 had been expended by the President.

For expenses necessary to assist the President in improving the management of executive agencies and in obtaining greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of more efficient business methods in Government operations, the committee has allowed \$350,000, which is a reduction of \$50,000 below the budget request. These funds enable the President to have studies conducted of the organization and operations of the executive branch and to develop and install improvements therein.

The committee allowed the full budget request of \$2,140,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission. \$1,140,000 of this \$2,140,000 is for salaries and expenses and the other \$1 million is for construction of memorials and cemeteries. It was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that this Commission has done an outstanding job. Under the able leadership of Brig. Gen. Thomas North, who has served as Secretary to the American Battle Monuments Commission, the construction program is nearing completion at about 2 or 3 million dollars less than the cost originally estimated. General North has done a fine job. In my opinion he is one of our finest public servants, and I certainly hope

he remains with the Commission until the job has been completed.

The Commission is responsible for the maintenance and operation of all permanent United States military cemeteries and memorials located in foreign countries. These include 8 World War I cemeteries, a memorial chapel in each cemetery, 11 World War I memorials outside the cemeteries, 14 World War II cemeteries, and the United States National Cemetery, Mexico City, Mexico. The higher estimate in 1957 for maintenance and operation reflects increasing requirements due to completion of various features of the construction program in World War II cemeteries and requirements for major repairs to be undertaken in the World War I cemeteries.

The estimate covers the 8th year's program requirements for construction of United States military cemeteries in foreign countries and memorials to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces in World War II. Construction covers the development of 15 locations in foreign countries and includes permanent headstones, erection of a memorial structure at each location, and other features such as landscaping, roads and paths, drainage, water supply, caretakers' houses, and visitors' and utility buildings required for operating purposes. In 1957 construction of a memorial in the national cemetery in Hawaii, and memorials on the east and west coast of the United States will be initiated.

Again, let me say in my opinion the American Battle Monuments Commission, under the able leadership of General North, has done an outstanding job. It was my pleasure to visit many of the cemeteries in Europe last August and September, and the beauty of these cemeteries is indescribable. The relatives of those who lie buried in our cemeteries overseas can rest assured that no expense has been spared in making these cemeteries as attractive as possible.

For the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission the committee has allowed \$695,000, which is a reduction of \$11,905 from the 1956 bill and \$5,000 less than the budget request. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is responsible for the settlement of claims authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948 and such other foreign claims as assigned. With the practical conclusion of settlement of World War II claims—the statutory deadline is August 31, 1956—the greater portion of administrative expenses must be met by appropriation, since the programs remaining do not provide for the financing of administrative expense from assets. The Chairman of the Commission indicated that, barring the passage of legislation authorizing additional claims programs, the work of the Commission should be completed by September 30, 1959.

For the Subversive Activities Control Board the Committee has allowed \$350,000, which is \$51,400 more than the appropriation for this agency during 1956. The volume of the work-load of this Board is dependent upon the number of petitions filed by the Attorney General's office with the Board. Upon petitions being filed, the Board holds for-

mal hearings and determines whether: First, organizations are Communist-action organizations, Communist-front organizations, or Communist-infiltrated organizations; second, individuals are officers or members of a Communist-action organization or officers of a Communist-front organization and required to register as such; third, the registration of particular Communist-action organizations or Communist-front organizations or of particular individuals should be canceled; and fourth, a particular organization has ceased to be a Communist-infiltrated organization. In each case the Board issues a report setting forth its ruling and findings as to the facts, and issues an appropriate order. The appeal by the Communist Party of the United States from the Board's order that the party register as a Communist-action organization is before the Supreme Court. Two Communist-front cases are before the United States Court of Appeals. It is expected that hearings in about 10 front and infiltrated cases will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1956, and an additional 12 or more will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1957. Since the committee hearings of the previous year, the rate of referral cases has increased, and it is apparent that the present small staff cannot maintain a desirable rate of progress. The amount provided will allow for a modest number of additional personnel and will thus enable the Board to proceed more effectively.

In conclusion, the total amount carried in this bill for the 14 agencies of Government is \$14,849,275, which is \$13,067,025 less than the amount carried in the 1956 appropriation bill for these same agencies, or an appropriation decrease of nearly 50 percent. The amount included in this bill is \$165,200 less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for these agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may have answered this question. I should like to ask the question, however, and I propose to ask the chairman of every appropriation committee that comes in here from now on the same question. Under the terms of this bill has employment increased?

Mr. ANDREWS. No. The increases under this bill where there are increases are due to the salary increase bill that the Congress passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any super grade positions made available under this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Not under this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. In discussing the American Battle Monuments Commission, this bill provides for that commission \$2,140,000. Is it not true that a large part of that amount will be counterpart funds?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Under our present arrangement, a year or two ago the Con-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

March 5, 1956
March 2, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 37

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....8	Farm program.....1,12	Natural resources.....5
Alaska.....17	Fisheries.....15	Price supports.....1,6
Appropriations.....9,11	Foreign aid.....16	Reclamation.....3,13
Banking.....24	Gasoline.....2	School milk.....10
Brucellosis.....10	Labeling.....21	Surplus property.....19
Cargo preference.....4	Lands.....17	Taxation.....2,23
Cooperatives.....20	Legislative program.....11	Timber.....5
Dairy industry.....21	Loans.....18	Tobacco.....22
Electrification.....20	Mining.....5,14	Transportation.....4
Farm housing.....18	Monopolies.....16	Wheat.....7

HIGHLIGHTS; Senate continued debate on farm bill. Senate committee reported bill to relieve farmers from excise tax on gasoline. President signed measures to increase allotments on burley, Maryland, and fire-cured and dark air-cured tobaccos. Sen. Sparkman introduced and discussed bill to extend farm-housing program. House committee reported Labor-HEW and independent offices appropriations bill for 1957.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 3183, the farm bill. p. 3363
Sens. Capehart, Welker, Anderson, Barrett (for himself and Sen. O'Mahoney), Clements (for himself and Sens. Barkley and Gore), and McCarthy submitted amendments intended to be proposed to the bill. p. 3331
Sen. Green inserted a resolution from the Rhode Island Agricultural Conference dealing with a variety of agricultural problems. p. 3327
2. FARM TAXES. The Finance Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8780, to relieve farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels used on the farm (S. Rept. 1609). p. 3328
3. RECLAMATION. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 500, authorizing the construction and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project. p. 3354
(House conferees have not yet been appointed.)
4. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Butler inserted a newspaper editorial critical of recent efforts to revise the Cargo Preference Act. p. 3331

March 2, 1956

-2-

5. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Murray inserted a number of articles relating to the "giveaway" of our natural resources. p. 3334
Sen. Neuberger criticized the Interior Department for its part in the Al Sarena timber case. p. 3361
6. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Murray inserted a survey report indicating that a majority of the farmers voting in Hardin Co., Iowa, favor 90 percent price supports. p. 3343
7. WHEAT. Sen. Barkley inserted a Ky. Farm Bureau Federation telegram urging that Kentucky be designated in the pending farm bill as a commercial-wheat area. p. 3344
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., March 5. p. 3367

HOUSE

9. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9720, the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Departments appropriation bill for 1957 (H. Rept. 1845), and H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957 (H. Rept. 1847). pp. 3368, 3390
10. SCHOOL MILK; BRUCELLOSIS. Received from the Cheese Producers' Marketing Association a resolution supporting H. R. 8320, providing additional funds for the school-milk and brucellosis eradication programs. p. 3391
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Acting Majority Leader, Rep. Albert, stated that on Mon., Mar. 5, the Consent Calendar would be called and the Labor-HEW appropriation bill would be considered; on Tues., Mar. 6, the Private Calendar would be called and the independent offices appropriation would be considered; and on Wed., Mar. 7, H. R. 2128, a patents extension bill, would be considered. p. 3370

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. King inserted a Fortune magazine article, "Farm Problem: 1956 Edition," and stated that "it seems to me to be an excellent analysis of the present farm problem." p. A1983
Rep. Hoffman inserted letters from two constituents describing how they have managed to keep and operate their farms. p. A1998
13. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Avery opposing the continued construction of Tuttle Creek Dam and stating that "it will inundate 5 towns." p. A1989
Speech in the House of Rep. Hosmer stating that "...the repayment provisions of H. R. 3383 (the upper Colorado River storage project bill) as amended are unsound and unworkable and would not provide repayment as claimed." p. A2001
14. MINING. Rep. Hoffman inserted Raymond Moley's article stating that an examination of the record into the Al Sarena mining case convinces him that the course was fair and logical and that the decision to grant the patents was proper under the law. p. A1997
15. FISHERIES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Pelly urging consideration of his bill, H. R. 9700, to establish a national policy with respect to the management and rehabilitation of our fisheries resources. p. A1997

fact that frequently in life we have to make a choice among evils.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the question before the Senate seems to me to offer an opportunity to make a few observations which I have had on my mind for a long time—long before this particular situation arose—revolving around the selection of a chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I suppose the Senator from Mississippi knows as well as I know that I do not agree with him about a good many things. I have differed with him in a great many respects during our joint membership in the Senate, particularly when I was the majority leader and was seeking to obtain votes on controversial questions, in which he cooperated with other Senators to prevent a vote. I was somewhat peeved at the Senator from Mississippi and also at some of our colleagues who joined in that enterprise. I might say that those Senators were so numerous that I did not get votes on many of the propositions on which I thought the Senate should vote.

I have disagreed on many problems with Members of the Senate who were chairman of other committees. I still disagree with some of them. If it were not for the intellectual friction which is created by debate in the Senate on fundamental ideals, this body would be even duller than it is. So I think it is advantageous to the country that we should differ now and then, and that we should have the courage to express our differences.

So when I say that I have differed and now differ with the Senator from Mississippi on many problems, I am only saying what I could say about other Senators.

I think it is unfortunate and regrettable that any Member of the United States Senate should anywhere, under any circumstances, urge the people, or any considerable number of them, to nullify, disregard, or flout the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Frequently we have heard, as we still hear, that ours is a government of laws, and not of men. I have never fully agreed with that theory. Ours is a government of laws and of men. Without men, we could have no laws, because men must enact the laws. Without men, the laws could not be interpreted, because it is necessary to interpret the laws. Without men, the laws could not be enforced.

So it has always seemed to me to be inconsistent, not only in the Senate, but elsewhere, for men to urge that ours is a government of laws, and not of men, when they oppose something; and then, on another occasion, when it suits their particular ideals or convenience, to urge that ours is a government of men, and not of laws.

To advocate or to urge that the people of the United States ignore the courts and to refuse to abide by their decisions would be, in effect, to nullify the law and to create men in their individual capacities as the interpreters and the executors of our laws. So I do not, in any sense, concur in the view that ours is a government either of laws or of men, sepa-

ately; I contend that it is a government of laws and of men. Men must enact the laws. Men must interpret the laws; otherwise, they would be dead letters on our statute books.

Therefore, I regret to have to observe that any Senator, especially one who occupies a position of responsibility and leadership, should advocate that people ignore the laws as interpreted by our courts, because that would ultimately and inevitably lead to chaos, lawlessness, and disorder in our country.

These remarks are not directed particularly at any Senator, but to all of us generally. Notwithstanding the fact, Mr. President, that I have disagreed, and probably will continue to disagree, in some respects, with the Senator from Mississippi, I respect his integrity. I respect his sincerity. I respect his ability. The problem before the Senate today is whether we shall follow the custom—not the law or the rule, except in an unwritten way—which has been, with 3 exceptions, adhered to by the Senate for 165 years, or whether we shall upset the method by which the Senate chooses the chairmen of its committees.

During all the history of the country and the Senate there have been arguments sincerely made by both sides and by all sides as to how the Senate should select the chairmen of its committees. The Senate has from time immemorial considered that question. The La Follette-Monroney joint committee, in 1946, in considering the Reorganization Act, considered very carefully and in detail the question of the choosing of the chairmen of committees by seniority, or by some other method. The committee was not able to find any better method than that which has been in vogue in the Senate ever since its establishment.

It has been nearly 30 years since I came to this body. For nearly 14 years I was a Member of the House. I had considered the question in the other House, and I have considered it in the Senate. Much as I admit, and I am free to admit, the imperfections of the seniority system, we have as yet been unable to devise a better system than the seniority system for the selection of chairmen of committees.

It has often been suggested that chairmen of committees be elected by the committees. In that event the element of personalities and favoritism would come into play, and there would be log-rolling and electioneering for the votes of the committee members by those who wanted to be chairmen. If the Senate should adopt that method I doubt very much that it would adhere to it very long, because it would result in a very unsatisfactory situation. Jealousies, ambitions, and all the frailties of human nature would crop out in the electioneering methods of men who wanted to be chairmen of committees.

I do not believe we could have a more satisfactory method by which the Senate selects chairmen of its committees than the method which has been in vogue, with the exception of the three cases mentioned, ever since the Senate was established.

In brief, the fact is that for nearly a century and three-quarters the Senate of the United States, as well as the House of Representatives, has chosen the chairmen of its committees by seniority, with rare exceptions, where the presumption of long experience and detailed knowledge of legislation has played some part. Neither House has ever been willing to adopt another method or has found a better method of choosing the chairmen of its committees.

While, as I have said, the system has its imperfections, on the whole it has brought forth some great men, men of outstanding intellect and character in the legislative history of the United States.

So, in the absence of any better method of choosing chairmen of committees, notwithstanding the fact that every now and then someone might become chairman of a committee to whose appointment we might be opposed, or entertain a feeling that it was not appropriate, neither I nor anybody else I know of has been able to suggest a better method for choosing the chairmen of our committees; and until somebody finds a better method I myself shall not advocate or approve of any other method by which chairmen of committees shall be selected.

We could go up and down the lists of our committees and express some opposition to a chairman or to his selection, based on our agreement or disagreement with his views about public matters, but here we recognize the right of every Senator, as we recognize the right of every American, to entertain views honestly arrived at, and to express his views; for of what value is it to think unless one can also speak? We believe in freedom of speech and freedom of thought.

So, Mr. President, without further imposition upon the time and patience of the Senate, I wish to say that I shall vote for the Senator from Mississippi to be chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, notwithstanding the fact that I disagree with him about a good many things, and he knows that I do.

I felt like making these remarks in justification of our method of choosing the chairmen of Senate committees, because any other method we might adopt, so far as I know now, would result in more harm than good, and would ultimately cause greater damage to the legislative process than would be caused by adhering to the system we have adopted and followed, with the three exceptions named by the Senator from Oregon, for whom I also have the deepest affection and respect.

For the reasons I have stated, I shall vote for the resolution submitted by my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, to name the Senator from Mississippi chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the unfinished business was not laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock, because the resolution which was then under consideration was a privileged matter.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navaho (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedkadee, Silt, and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Goosberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a

single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications of the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit.

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): *Provided further*, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of na-

tional security. All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "basin fund"), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 8.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act.

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed 100 years;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years.

(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the upper division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 percent; Utah, 21.5 percent; Wyoming, 15.5 percent; and New Mexico, 17 percent; *Provided*, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1),

(2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

Revenue so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this act, (2) costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable

amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of water apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navaho initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this act, but not to exceed \$760 million.

SEC. 13. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the pay-outs of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 16. As used in this act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin," "Colorado River compact," "Colorado River system," "Lee Ferry," "States of the upper division," "upper basin," and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

The term "States of the upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "upper basin";

The term "upper Colorado River Basin compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

The term "economic life," as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in replacement costs for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATOR MILLIKIN, OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on the occasion of the passage of what is known as the upper Colorado River storage bill in the House of Representatives, it seems only fitting and proper that those who have had the vision and the foresight and the courage to fight and work for years for such a project should be mentioned. It would be very difficult, of course, to name all of them.

They include the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and many others. But I wish to speak particularly of my own colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Senator MILLIKIN has always been an active participant in Colorado River problems and their solutions since he came to the Senate in 1942.

Proposals before the Congress for developments in the lower Colorado River Basin were closely related to developments throughout the basin; and, so far as Senator MILLIKIN was concerned, developments in the State of Colorado were a part of the development in the upper basin. Continuous work by the Senator brought forth the interim report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River, which was printed as House Document No. 419 in the 80th Congress. The date of this document is July 1947. The efforts of Senator MILLIKIN were most helpful in connection with the upper Colorado River Basin compact. This was printed as Senate Document No. 8, 81st Congress, January 31, 1949.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, Senator MILLIKIN held hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 145, 80th Congress, on May 10 to 14, inclusive, 1948. This resolution also expedited action by the United States to determine water rights on the river with respect to both upper and lower basins, but particularly its purpose was to settle the dispute in the lower basin.

The Senator participated in the hearings on S. 75 and Senate Joint Resolution 4, 81st Congress, which extended over a long period, namely, March 21 to 31, inclusive; April 2, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 30, and May 2, 1949. This was a bill to authorize the central Arizona project.

Senator MILLIKIN was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which held hearings in the 83d Congress on S. 1555, a bill to authorize the Colorado River storage project. These hearings extended over 6 days, June 28 to July 3, inclusive, 1954. The Senator presented the report on the bill—Senate Report No. 1983—on July 26, 1954.

In the 84th Congress, Senator MILLIKIN participated actively in the hearings on S. 500, which, like S. 1555 in the previous Congress, would authorize the

Colorado River storage project. These hearings extended from February 28 to March 5, inclusive, 1955.

Early in 1953, after President Eisenhower was inaugurated, Senator MILLIKIN, with other congressional representatives of the upper basin States, consulted with the President and with important administration and Cabinet members, including the then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Interior, and others having responsibility over the proposal. These gentlemen became proponents of the storage project for the upper basin. Undoubtedly Senator MILLIKIN, as chairman of the Republican conference committee, was instrumental in bringing to the attention of men outside of the reclamation States the great importance of land and water development to the Nation as a whole, as well as to the States affected.

It seems to me that Senator MILLIKIN expressed in a well-rounded summary his philosophy with respect to the storage project, in the closing paragraphs of his speech on the floor of the Senate on April 18, 1955. They are as follows:

Those of us who live under water-conservation projects which irrigate arid lands and which develop power, can see every day the direct and indirect benefits of incalculable size resulting from those projects.

If I may mention my own State, I can say that wherever we have operating water projects, we have prosperity among individuals in the communities affected.

If it were not for its water projects which help to produce a more rounded economy, the State of Colorado would be a State of scattered grazing activities, and it would be sending to the Treasury of the United States only a small fraction of the income taxes and other revenues which now amount to about three-quarters billion dollars annually.

The proposed reservoirs for water conservation, river regulation, power production, and the participating areas for watering arid lands, will be wealth-producing assets which will go far beyond the immediate benefits to those in position to share them.

Communities will be founded and expanded under the operation of those projects. They will help in the production of local and national tax revenues. There will be cumulative and expanding cycles of productive wealth and prosperity for the benefit of the United States and of the States involved.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the upper Colorado River storage project bill has now been passed by both Houses of the Congress, and has been referred to a conference committee, upon which the great senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], my able colleague, has been appointed to serve as a member. Without in any way or in any sense detracting from the many great and highly valuable contributions of the other Members of the Senate and of the Members of the House, in both parties, who have worked so long and so diligently with this great ideal and this great idea for the West in their hearts, I wanted to take this opportunity to extend to Senator MILLIKIN our thanks for his able work. All of us know, of course, and I was very glad to see, that he is able to serve as a member of the conference committee which will deal with this great piece of legislation.

MODERNIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I read with considerable interest in this morning's Washington Post that President Eisenhower had at long last set in motion some degree of activity, aimed at modernizing the hopelessly obsolete and dangerous air-traffic control systems of the Nation.

I refer to the announcement of the appointment of a friend of the President, a former distinguished officer in World War II, and vice president of the Eastman Kodak Co., Mr. Edward P. Curtis. He was appointed to conduct a long-range study, to try to provide for a greater degree of air safety, through a study of air-navigation facilities in line with the report of the so-called Harding committee.

This Harding report was submitted under date of December 31, 1955, became available on January 13, 1956, to the public, and then to the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman at this time.

We are glad that at long last, that finally, someone in this administration has awakened to the fact that the overcrowding and congestion of our airways is not only limiting the expansion of a dynamic method of transportation, but is actually creating a situation that is becoming more dangerous by the hour.

TIMID-DELAYED APPROACH

In order to understand what has been going on, as a result of the timid approach to doing something about a condition which everyone concerned with civil aviation knew had been existing for a long time, we received, as I have stated, on December 31, the Harding report. This report recognizing the existence of the conditions about which many of us have complained for a long time.

In fact, I believe it would be fair to say that the Harding report recognized and verified that which the former Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Frederick B. Lee, had been telling the congressional committees, in particular, the Appropriations Committees. He had also been telling the Nation, as he often spoke at aviation meetings and dinners in many States, that the condition desperately required immediate remedial action and sufficient funds to provide modern navigation facilities.

LEE FIRED FOR STAND

Because he had the courage to speak out and tell the truth, Mr. Lee, a lifetime Republican, and a career employee who had worked up through the ranks of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, was summarily fired.

I say "fired" advisedly, because our hearings demonstrated that he was fired because he chose to carry out his duty in testifying before Senate and House committees as to the immediate, urgent, and desperate need for modernizing our air navigation and transportation facilities.

HAMSTRUNG BY COMMERCE SECRETARY

While Mr. Lee was being hamstrung, while his resignation was being demand-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

March 8, 1956
March 7, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 40

CONTENTS

Administration.....29	Food and drug.....15	Prices.....11
Appropriations.....2,9,27	Foreign affairs.....7	support.....3
Budget.....17	Foreign trade.....30	Property.....26
Cotton.....11	Forestry.....5,19,25	Reclamation.....10,14
Dairy industry.....28	4-H Club.....20	River basin.....24
Disaster relief.....9	Housing.....31	Small business.....18
Electrification.....14	Lands.....26	Supergrades.....9
Expenditures.....17	Natural resources.....4	Surplus commodities.....12
Family farms.....11	Newsprint.....19	Treaties.....7
Farm program.....1,11,21	Peanuts.....13	Water resources.....16
Fisheries.....16,25	Personnel.....6,9,23	Wheat.....8
Flood control.....22	Plywood.....5	

HIGHLIGHTS; Senate continued debate on farm bill. Senate passed Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957. House passed independent offices appropriation bill for 1957. Rep. Grant lamented the decline in farmers' income and the cost-price squeeze, and, joined by several other Representatives, urged action to improve the farmers' economy. Received from Attorney-General draft legislation to authorize donation of surplus commodities to Bureau of Prisons.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 3183, the farm bill. p. 3673
Sens. Hayden, Ellender (for Sen. Douglas), Martin, Case of S. Dak., Bricker, O'Mahoney, and Bennett submitted amendments intended to be proposed to the bill. p. 3661
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 9064, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957. Senate conferees were appointed. p. 3670
3. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Langer inserted a local Republican Party resolution urging support for the 90 percent of parity provision in the farm bill. p. 3651
4. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Morse inserted a resolution from a Woodworkers Union criticizing the natural resources conservation policies of Secretary McKay. p. 3652
5. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse inserted a local labor union resolution favoring the amendment of existing trade agreements for greater protection of the plywood industry. p. 3653
6. PERSONNEL. Sen. Morse inserted a local labor union resolution favoring liberalization of annuity payments under the Civil Service Retirement system. p. 3654

March 7, 1956

-2-

7. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Judiciary Committee reported with an amendment S. J. Res. 1, proposing an amendment of the U. S. Constitution relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and international agreements (no written report -- to be filed later). p. 3654
8. WHEAT. Sen. Neuberger inserted a Wheat Growers League resolution favoring the domestic parity plan for wheat. p. 3668

HOUSE

9. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957. The amendments agreed to included an increase of \$5,386,030 for the FCDA disaster relief funds, a deletion of language authorizing eleven supergrade positions in GSA, and a deletion of language making ineffective the compulsory retirement provisions as contained in the original bill. p. 3623
10. RECLAMATION. Conferees on S. 500, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Storage Project, were appointed. p. 3621
Senate conferees were appointed on Mar. 2.
11. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Grant and several other Representatives lamented the decline in farmers' income and the effect on the family-sized farm of the cost-price squeeze. Rep. Grant urged favorable consideration of his bill H. R. 9703, to authorize direct payments in cash to cotton producers who complied with acreage allotments for 1954, 1955, and 1956. p. 3642
12. COMMODITIES. Both Houses received from the Attorney General a draft of legislation to authorize the donation to the Prison Bureau of commodities acquired through price support operations; to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and the House Agriculture Committee. pp. 3648, 3651
13. PEANUTS. Rep. Grant offered a "salute to Mr. Peanut" on the occasion of National Peanut Week. p. 3621

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. RECLAMATION; ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Morse inserted a Springfield (Oreg.) Utility Board letter supporting the proposed high Hells Canyon Dam and opposing the program of the Idaho Power Co. for its low dam. p. A2097
15. FOOD AND DRUG. Sen. Hill inserted a newspaper editorial reviewing the history of the Food and Drug Administration. p. A2098
16. FISHERIES; WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Colmer expressing concern over the resolution adopted by the Inter-American Council of Jurists dealing with the legal extent of territorial waters and related matters to which the U. S. was compelled to take "strong exception." p. A2105
17. BUDGET; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Fulton inserted the recent address of Rep. Simpson describing the accomplishments of the administration and the Congress in restoring fiscal responsibility at the national level. p. A2109
18. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Hays, Ohio, inserted Eric Sevareid's recent article explaining the "plight" of small business. p. A2112



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1956

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made us the heirs and beneficiaries of Thy divine bounty, grant that in all the hours of this day we may have the inspiration of Thy companionship and sustaining grace.

May our plans and purposes always reflect the spirit of our blessed Lord and may our whole life be in tune with the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Emancipate us from all fears and worries and may our vision of the highest and noblest never become dimmed or eclipsed by worldly compromise and petty ambitions.

Make us more confident of Thy greatness and goodness and more assured of Thy faithfulness as we strive to follow in the way of Thy commandments.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; and

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, O'BRIEN of New York, DAWSON of Utah, and SAYLOR.

NATIONAL PEANUT WEEK

(Mr. GRANT asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, this is National Peanut Week. More people each year are realizing the wonderful food value of peanuts. They are wholesome and nutritious, full of energy-giving vitamins, and delicious to eat. They are good for young and old alike.

Many people look upon the peanut as just something you buy at the ball park or the circus. Children and many adults are familiar with the delectable flavor of peanut butter and peanut candy bars. However, there are also many, many recipes calling for the use of peanuts. For cooking purposes there is no better fat than peanut oil. For frying fish, chicken, and other meats, it cannot be excelled.

Last week our colleague WATT ABBITT, from Virginia, placed a supply of roasted peanuts in the cloakrooms. Let us hope that he will do this again this week.

Have you ever eaten boiled peanuts? If not, you have really missed something.

So let us upon this occasion of National Peanut Week salute Mr. Peanut.

GEORGIA GIRL MADE TEXAS' FIRST LONE STAR FLAG OUT OF OWN SILK DRESSES

(Mrs. BLITCH asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include an article by Margaret Shannon appearing in the Atlanta Journal.)

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, I include at this point in the Record an article

written by the very able reporter, Miss Margaret Shannon, in the Atlanta Journal on February 12, 1956. The title of the article is "Georgia Girl Made Texas' First Lone Star Flag Out of Own Silk Dresses."

Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, March 2, the State of Texas celebrated its Independence Day. All of us rejoice with Texas in its glorious history, and I think that it will be agreed that one of the reasons Texas has so much to be proud of is the fact that it is made up of people whose ancestors were so attracted to Texas that they left most every section of the Union and went to Texas to make their home.

Texas and her cause so caught the imagination of the people of this country that even those who did not move to Texas sought to contribute to the spirit that moved Texas to become first a republic and then one of our greatest States. One of those people was a young Georgia girl whose name was Joanna Troutman. The following article tells the story of her great contribution to Texas history, and the high regard with which Texas holds her.

The article follows:

GEORGIA GIRL MADE TEXAS' FIRST LONE-STAR FLAG OUT OF OWN SILK DRESSES

(By Margaret Shannon)

The suggestion that Georgia adopt a new State flag seems to have generated interest in the subject of State flags.

As I've related before, there's a monument in Knoxville, Ga., to Joanna Troutman, the Georgia girl who designed the Lone-Star flag of Texas.

She made the banner for Georgia volunteers to use when they went to Texas to fight in its war of independence against Mexico in the 1830's. The Republic of Texas adopted the design, and the State of Texas later continued to use it.

Now comes an Atlantian, Mrs. V. A. Wilson, 2066 Evergreen Lane NW., to relate that her mother's efforts brought posthumous recognition for the Betsy Ross of Texas.

HANDMADE

"I remember hearing my mother tell about this young girl who used the silk from two of her own dresses to make the flag," Mrs. Wilson says.

Her mother was Mrs. Louis L. Brown, of Fort Valley. About 45 years ago, she interested the then governor of Texas, O. B. Col-

quitt, in seeing that something be done in honor of the memory of Joanna Troutman.

As a result of Mrs. Brown's and Governor Colquitt's interest, a monument was erected in Austin, the Texas capital, and Miss Troutman's body was moved there.

"Mother was invited to be the guest of the State of Texas and escort the body to Austin," Mrs. Wilson related. "She declined the honor because her youngest child was a baby at the time and she felt her first duties were at home."

Mrs. Wilson has many souvenirs connected with the matter, including the executive order which Governor Colquitt sent to the Texas Senate and House of Representatives on February 26, 1913.

But Mrs. Wilson tells another interesting story which shows that Texas did not wait nearly 100 years to honor the girl who designed the flag.

While Texas still was a republic, its first minister to the United States stopped by Milledgeville, Ga., on his way to Washington to assume his diplomatic post. Milledgeville was the Georgia capital at the time.

The diplomat called on the Governor of Georgia, and left with him several pieces of a silver service that had belonged to Santa Anna, the Mexican general who was captured by the Texans in the war for independence.

The diplomat specified that the silver was to be sent to Miss Troutman in appreciation for the flag that she had made—a big blue star on a field of white. According to Mrs. Wilson, some of the silver still is in the possession of Miss Troutman's family.

Texas has had the same flag ever since Joanna Troutman's day. The only change in 125 years has been to reverse the colors to make the star white and the background blue.

(Mr. BURLESON asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I wish to express our very deep appreciation to the lady from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] for her very kind words.

In addition to the contribution mentioned by the lady, Georgia has had a great influence on the State of Texas. She sent men who fought with Houston at San Jacinto and from that time on, Georgia's citizens came to the new West to develop her frontiers and materially contributed to the great progress which has steadily gone forward to the present. There is a close affinity between our two great States and we in Texas are appreciative of that association.

RESERVE RECRUITMENT

(Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that we all are interested in figures on our Reserve recruitment. These figures are available from week to week, and I am pleased to tell you that the latest weekly figures show the enlistment of 1,082 people in the 6 months Reserve training program, which, you know, became the law with the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. This is the third week for which figures on enlistments exceeded the 1,000 mark for a single week. Our overall

Army program shows enlistments of 1,804 persons for last week. Since the Army goal for the year is limited by law to 90,000 spaces, it is entirely within the realm of probability that the Army will reach this goal.

Enlistments are climbing from week to week, and at the current rate of increase there may be yet a real fight on the part of enlistees to avail themselves of vacancies under the 6 months training program, with 7½ years in the Reserve.

I am further pleased to say that the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force programs are proceeding much more satisfactorily. The National Guard recruited 20,000 persons for the month of February, which is a record in recruitment. Both the guard and the Reserve are now beginning to furnish heavy enlistments into the regular services from those recruits who, having tasted of military service, wish to enlist and become a part of the Regular Establishment.

LIBERALIZATION OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which proposes three principal ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits, which I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House.

Several different bills have been introduced, and one bill along this line, H. R. 9065, is now before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I favor the provisions of H. R. 9065, as far as they go, but, in my judgment, the benefits do not extend far enough to bring aid to railroad pensioners who are in the most serious need at the present time.

There are now many thousands of retired railroadmen, and their widows, who have paid into the retirement fund—many of them 18 years. When they were paying their dollars to this pension fund, and when they finally retired, for one reason or another, the amount they could draw was based on the normal wage scale at that time, when we were not living in an inflationary period. Now, these particular pensioners, their wives and dependents, due to the fact that the cost of living has practically doubled since the time their pensions were established, find themselves in a condition where a great many of them are in serious want, because their pensions are so small they cannot nearly meet the present high cost of living.

Now, the bill I have introduced proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. First, it reduces the age providing for earlier retirement at age 60 with 30 years of service, or with 35 years of service regardless of age.

Second, and this is very important, it provides for computation of credit for service performed prior to 1937, which today is based on the average earnings

for the period 1924-31, which has no relation to our present economy, and substitutes in lieu thereof the five highest years of the employees' working career.

The reduction of the retirement age after many years of service is needed to care for those who lose their railroad positions at advanced ages, but before they have reached 65. Thousands of former railroad employees whose positions were abolished through changes in transportation, through no fault of their own, find themselves at an age when they can no longer find other employment. We are now living in an age when a man over 50, and many men younger, who are in splendid physical condition cannot secure employment because of their age, so you can see the impossible situation an older retired railroad man faces at the present time in securing employment.

When a railroad man finds himself in that position, who needs work and cannot get it, he also cannot draw his pension benefits because of the present rigid retirement age that forces him to wait until he reaches the age of 65.

There are a lot of railroad men today, after years of service, who find themselves in ill health and not physically able to hold jobs, and yet they cannot qualify for disability pension benefits, but have to wait until they are 65 years of age.

If they could begin their pension benefits at 60 years of age, it would help out this considerable group of former railroad employees.

It does seem that Congress should attempt to give some relief to these employees referred to, who, without fault of their own, lost their positions a few years before reaching that age.

Third, my bill provides a 15 percent increase in annuities and pensions, which will help all people now retired. While the provisions discussed above are designed to ease hardships on special classes of annuitants, all annuitants would be benefited by the 15 percent increase. There is a general economic problem shared by all annuitants, which would be greatly improved by enactment of this 15 percent increase.

I hope that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may widen the scope of its legislation, and give consideration to and embody in whatever bill they report the provisions I refer to in this proposed legislation.

There are many retired railroad men and their widows who need these benefits, and who are interested in this legislation, living in my district, at Centralia, Salem, Bluford, Hillsboro, and Mount Carmel, Ill.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE ARMORIES

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 28, 1956
For actions of March 27, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 54

CONTENTS

Accounting.....6	Foreign trade.....27	Price supports.....1,26
Acreage allotments.....11	Forestry.....9,14,33	Property.....13
Appropriations.....4,13	Fruits.....7	Reclamation.....3
Conservation.....24	Gasoline.....2,12	Reference service.....23
Cooperatives.....22	Information.....23	Research.....8,28
Cotton.....1,11	Livestock.....26	Social security.....19
Credit unions.....30	Milk.....15,19	Soil bank.....1,26
Dairy products.....5,15	Monopolies.....34	Stockpiling.....13
Electrification.....22	Newsprint.....9	Surplus commodities.....5,8
Farm program.....1,20,35	Organization, executive.....16	Taxation.....2,12
Fisheries.....24	Personnel.....31	TVA.....22
Flood control.....17	Postal rates.....32	Water resources.....24,29
Food and drugs.....7	Poultry products.....25	Wool.....27
Foreign aid.....21		

HIGHLIGHTS: Conferees reached agreement on several provisions of farm bill. Senate agreed to conference report on bill to relieve farmers of excise tax on gasoline. House received conference report on bill to relieve farmers of excise tax on gasoline. House received conference report on Colorado River storage project bill. Rep. Johnson, Wis., alleged that this administration did not inherit dairy products surplus. Rep. Cooley and others suggested that conference report on farm bill would be ready after Easter recess. House received conference report on Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957. Rep. Harvey urged favorable consideration of measure for research in industrial use of agricultural products.

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states: "Conferees continued, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate and House-passed versions of H. R. 12, Agricultural Act of 1956. Following today's session, it was announced that the conferees had agreed to (1) adopt 90 percent of parity for 1 year for basic crops, (2) adopt the dual-parity formula as passed by the Senate and require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study of parity formulas, with submission of his recommendations thereon to the Congress not later than January 30, 1957, and (3) with regard to the proposed soil-bank program, strike from the bill limitations of \$100,000 as total price support to be received by any one person, \$25,000 as total amount to be received by any one person on acreage programs, and \$7,500 as total amount to be received by any one person on conservation reserves.

"In an afternoon session, the conferees agreed to strike out the provision in the bill passed by the Senate providing for change in the import quotas for extra-long staple cotton, and adopted revised language directing the sale for export at competitive world prices CCC stocks of such cotton." p. D297

Rep. Hoffman speculated on the possibility of consideration of H. R. 12, the farm bill, on Thurs. or Fri., Mar. 29 or 30. p. 5080

March 27, 1956

Rep. Cooley, Majority Leader, McCormack, and others expressed the opinion that because of the complicated nature of the farm bill, the conference report would not be ready until after the Easter recess. p. 5086

2. TAXATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 8780, to provide for the relief of farmers from the Federal excise tax on gasoline used on the farm (H. Rept. 1957). pp. 5075, 5098
3. RECLAMATION. Received the conference report on S. 500, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project (H. Rept. 1950) (pp. 5076, 5098). Unanimous consent was requested for the consideration of the conference report, but Rep. Hiestand objected (p. 5085).
4. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 9064, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957 (H. Rept. 1956). pp. 5085, 5098
5. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Rep. Johnson, Wis., alleged that the so-called dairy products surplus was not inherited by this Administration, but rather that the surplus had increased under this Administration. p. 5079
6. ACCOUNTING. The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee ordered reported with amendments to the full committee H. R. 9593, to simplify accounting and facilitate the payment of obligations. p. D296
7. FRUITS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 7732, to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act regarding artificial coloring of oranges. p. D296
8. RESEARCH. Rep. Harvey and others urged favorable consideration of bills providing for research in the industrial uses of agricultural products. Rep. Harvey spoke specifically in favor of his bill, H. R. 10125. p. 5091
9. FORESTRY. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee submitted an interim report, "Newsprint Study--Newsprint Outlook for 1956" (H. Rept. 1953). p. 5098
10. STOCKPILING. Both Houses received from CDM the report on the stockpiling program for July 1 to December 31, 1955. pp. 5014, 5098
11. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Received from the S. C. Legislature memorials requesting legislation for cotton acreage allotments for the small farmers in S. C. p. 5099

SENATE

12. TAXES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8780, to relieve farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes. The report resolved a substantive difference between the two Houses on whether a custom operator who used gasoline for cultivating the soil and raising crops was entitled to the gasoline refund. The report provides that such refunds will be payable only to the farmer on whose farm the gasoline is used and not to the custom operator. p. 5071
13. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee concluded hearings on H. R. 10004, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1956. p. D294

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT,
OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE
PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

MARCH 27, 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ENGLE, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 500]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: *That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: Provided, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level, and that construction thereof shall not*

be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskaadee, Silt and Smith Fork: Provided further, That as part of the Glen Canyon Unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Narajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States, which in the case of the San Juan-Chama project shall include the State of Texas, and thereafter to the President and the Congress: Provided, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Secretary, concurrently with the investigations directed by the preceding paragraph, shall also give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project.

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): Provided, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): Provided further, That for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: Provided, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by

subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unmortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years.

(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the Upper Division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 per centum; Utah, 21.5 per centum; Wyoming, 15.5 per centum; and New Mexico, 17 per centum: Provided, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereinafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to such requirement, there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof, which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act; (2) costs of the Paonia project, which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay, within a period

prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181); and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. In the event that the Navajo participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from, and the cost of, constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered unto under said Compacts and Acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is author-

ized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water arcs created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of, and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 11. The Final Judgment, Final Decree and stipulations incorporated therein in the consolidated cases of United States of America v. Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al., Civil Nos. 2782, 5016 and 5017, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, are approved, shall become effective immediately, and the proper agencies of the United States shall act in accordance therewith.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed \$760,000,000.

SEC. 13. In planning the use of, and in using credits from, net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of said States of the fullest practicable use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of

the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to continue studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin on the quality of water of the Colorado River.

SEC. 16. As used in this Act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin", "Colorado River Compact", "Colorado River System", "Lee Ferry", "States of the Upper Division", "Upper Basin", and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

The term "States of the Upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "Upper Basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

The term "Treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

And the House agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language incorporates the recommendations of the conference committee with respect to each of the differences between the Senate and House bills.

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

With respect to the scope of the project, the conference committee agreed to retain in the bill for authorization only the four storage units and eleven participating projects in the House-approved bill.

The matter of retaining intact our national park system was an important issue in the consideration by Congress of this legislation. The House-approved bill—

- (1) deleting the Echo Park storage unit;
- (2) requiring "protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument"; and
- (3) expressing the "intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument"—

makes clear the intention of the House that there be no invasion or impairment of the national park system by the works authorized to be constructed under this legislation. The conference committee upheld the House position and adopted the House-approved language.

The Juniper project would have been authorized as a storage unit by the language in the Senate bill. The House language would have required the Secretary to give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit in the event he found the Curecanti unit infeasible. The conference committee adopted substitute language, which requires that priority be given to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project but removes the contingency in the House language and does not specify whether the Juniper project is to be a storage unit or a participating project.

The conference committee adopted House language requiring the Secretary to give priority to completion of planning reports on certain participating projects including those, except Woody Creek, which would have been conditionally authorized by the language in the Senate bill.

The sum of \$760 million remains in the bill as the amount authorized to be appropriated. However, the conference committee, in retaining this amount in the bill, agreed that it should not be earmarked project-wise and that there is no prohibition against the use of such funds for the construction of the Curecanti unit, subject to the certification by the Secretary required in section 1 of the act.

REPAYMENT PLAN AND BASIN FUND

With respect to the repayment plan incorporated in the legislation, the conference committee agreed to and adopted language in the Senate bill, which requires the repayment with interest of costs allocated to power in not to exceed 50 years—a requirement that is in accordance with presently established policy.

The House-approved bill contained language setting out certain accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. The conference committee adopted the language of the House bill, which provides for the establishment, from surplus power revenues of the storage project, of credits, within the basin fund, to each State of the upper basin for financial assistance to irrigation development in such State. It should be understood that the revenues thus credited to the States are only for use, within the individual States, in assisting the construction of Federal reclamation projects and shall not be used for any other purpose.

INDIAN LANDS

The House-approved bill contained language making nonreimbursable the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands which are beyond the capability of such lands to repay. The conference committee agreed to and adopted substitute language limiting this provision to the Navajo participating project. This language was adopted in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation and not just the upper basin States.

OPERATION OF POWER FACILITIES

Section 7 of the House-approved bill, containing a grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior relating to operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed by S. 500, has been amended by the conference committee in two respects.

The first sentence of section 7, directing the Secretary to operate such facilities so as to produce the greatest amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm rates, has been amended through adoption of substitute language which relates to the grant of authority to the Secretary, and provides that such operation—

* * * shall not affect or interfere with the operations of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said Compacts and Acts.

This language has been adopted to make clear the intent that all of the instruments constituting the law of the Colorado River shall be read together by the Secretary of the Interior in the operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained by this legislation.

In a similar vein, the conference committee has adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House-approved language contained in the second sentence in section 7. The language of this sentence, which deals with the impounding and use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project, has been rewritten to make clear the intent of Congress that, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact,

such impounding and use shall be subservient to the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes.

APPROVAL OF FINAL COURT DECREE RELATING TO BLUE RIVER WATER

The Senate bill contained language authorizing conveyance to the city of Denver of certain water rights used for the production of power at Green Mountain Dam on the Blue River in Colorado. The conference committee adopted substitute language. These water rights have been the subject of prolonged litigation between the United States, Denver, and water users on both the eastern and western slopes of Colorado in the consolidated cases of the *United States of America v. Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. Since the Senate action on S. 500, agreement has been reached between representatives of the eastern slope and western slope of Colorado, and a final decree has been filed by the United States district court in this matter. Copies of the final decree and stipulations have been submitted to the Congress. The substitute language adopted by the conference committee gives immediate congressional approval to the final judgment, final decree and stipulations and instructs the proper agencies of the United States to act in accordance therewith.

PLANNING OF FUTURE PROJECTS

With respect to House language in section 13 of the bill, relating to the planning of future projects by the Secretary, the conference committee adopted substitute language which does not change the intended purpose of this section. The intention of the language is to require the Secretary, in planning additional developments in the upper basin, to give consideration to achievement, within each of the States, of the fullest practicable use of the water apportioned to each State. Since, under section 5, revenues to assist irrigation development are apportioned to the States on the basis of the estimated percentages of upper-basin water remaining to be developed in each such State, the intention of this section could also be stated as requiring the Secretary, in planning future projects, to give consideration to the revenues which it is anticipated will be available for repayment of such projects.

CONSENT TO SUIT OF UNITED STATES

Section 14 of the bill, which gives consent to joinder of the United States as a party to an action or actions by any State of the Colorado River Basin asserting noncompliance with the provisions of law made applicable by this section, has been amended to make clear the intent of Congress that the United States may be joined as a party thereto as a defendant or otherwise.

QUALITY-OF-WATER STUDIES

The House-approved bill included language in section 15 requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make certain quality-of-water studies. The conference committee adopted substitute language which, al-

though not as specific, accomplishes the same purpose and recognizes that such studies are already required by law and are underway.

OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE LANGUAGE

With respect to all other major differences between the House and the Senate bills not discussed hereinbefore, the conference committee concurred in and adopted the House language.

In conclusion, one additional observation appears in order: Throughout the hearings and deliberations of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this legislation, in floor presentation and debate, and in the several sessions of the conference committee, there has existed unity of understanding and agreement on the purpose of this legislation. That purpose is to authorize the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and to provide for the operation of the facilities thereof in accordance with the law of the Colorado River.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,

Managers on the Part of the House.





REFUND OF GASOLINE TAXES FOR FARMERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 8780) to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax for farmers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1957)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(A) by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife, on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator; except that if such use is by any person other than the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm, then (i) for purposes of this subparagraph, in applying subsection (a) to this subparagraph, and for purposes of section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii) (but not for purposes of section 4041), the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which gasoline or a liquid taxable under section 4041 is used shall be treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline or liquid, and (ii) for purposes of applying section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii), any tax paid under section 4041 in respect of a liquid used on a farm for farming purposes (within the meaning of this subparagraph) shall be treated as having been paid by the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which such liquid is used;" and the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,

W. D. MILLS,

NOBLE J. GREGORY,

DANIEL A. REED,

By T. A. JENKINS,

THOMAS A. JENKINS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,

WALTER F. GEORGE,

By HARRY F. BYRD,

ROBT. KERR,

EDWARD MARTIN,

FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, submit the following statement

in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 6420 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as proposed to be amended by the bill as it passed both the House and Senate, prescribe the uses of gasoline which for purposes of the bill are to be treated as use for farming purposes. Senate amendment No. 1 struck out subparagraph (A) and inserted a substitute. No change was made in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D).

Under subparagraph (A) of the House bill, gasoline was to be treated as used for farming purposes if used by "any person" in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

Under Senate amendment No. 1, gasoline used for any of the purposes set forth in the preceding paragraph was to be treated as used for farming purposes only if used by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm (1) on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator, or (2) on any other farm (but only if the gasoline used by him on other farms is less than one-half of all gasoline used by him, during the period with respect to which claim is filed, on all farms for the purposes set forth in the preceding paragraph). Thus, under the Senate amendment gasoline used by a custom operator or other independent contractor in performing a service for one of the purposes specified in section 6420 (c) (3) (A) was not to be included in any refund claim.

Under the conference agreement, as under the House bill and the Senate amendment, if gasoline is used on a farm by the owner, tenant, or operator thereof for the purposes set forth above, he will be entitled to the payment provided for under the new section 6420 if he is the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline. In addition, under the conference agreement, if gasoline is used on a farm by any other person for these purposes, the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm is treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of the gasoline, and is therefore entitled to the payment. For example, where a custom operator uses the gasoline, the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which the gasoline is used will be entitled to the payment. In general, in the case where a custom operator performs services described in the new section 6420 (c) (3) (A) on a farm, the payment under section 6420 (a) will be made to the person (the owner, tenant, or operator, as the case may be) for whom such services are performed.

Under the conference agreement, comparable rules are provided with respect to diesel fuel and special motor fuels. For example, if a custom operator performs services described in the new section 6420 (c) (3) (A) and uses a special fuel in a motor vehicle, the tax imposed by section 4041 (b) would apply but the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which the fuel is used will be entitled to a refund of the tax paid with respect to the fuel used on the farm. As in the case of gasoline, the refund will, in general, be made to the person (the owner, tenant, or operator, as the case may be) for whom the custom operator performed the services.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments are clerical. The House recedes.

HOWARD W. SMITH,

OREN HARRIS,

JOS. P. O'HARA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ILLUMINATING MARINE CORPS WAR MEMORIAL AT NIGHT

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide that the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery shall be illuminated at night and that the flag shall be flown at such memorial 24 hours a day.

The suggestion arises from a young friend, some 15 years of age, who was on a visit to the Capital last week. He arrived at night. His desire was to see the Marine Memorial. He saw Lincoln's Memorial which was illuminated. He saw the Capitol. It, too, was illuminated. He saw many illuminated things. The Marine Corps Memorial was not visible. It was blacked out. I suggest that the Marine Corps Memorial be made visible round the clock.

Before listing below the wording of the bill as it is introduced, I should like to thank Jimmy Sieminski, son of my cousin, Ramon, for his observation. I am sure that Jimmy's classmates at the Salisbury School, in Connecticut, will be pleased that one of their number made the suggestion which I pass on the House. I believe the bill has merit and that others do too:

H. R. 10239

A bill to provide that the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of the Arlington National Cemetery shall be illuminated at night and that the flag shall be flown at such memorial for 24 hours a day

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to provide for the illumination of the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery during the hours of darkness.

(b) Notwithstanding any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," approved June 22, 1942, as amended (36 U. S. C., sec. 170 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to fly the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the flagpole constituting a part of the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit and hold hearings this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Education and Labor is now conducting hearings to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, pertaining to school legislation in areas affected by Federal activities. Hearings are being held in room 429, Old House Office Building. Any Members who desire to appear before the committee will be heard either this afternoon or tomorrow.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1950)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level, and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-

generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskaadee, Silt and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon Unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

"SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichl Creek, East River, Ohlo Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States, which in the case of the San Juan-Chama project shall include the State of Texas, and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

"The Secretary, concurrently with the investigations directed by the preceding paragraph, shall also give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project.

"SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder

with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an 'organization' as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): *Provided further*, That for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

"(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of comple-

tion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years.

"(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the Upper Division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 per centum; Utah, 21.5 per centum; Wyoming, 15.5 per centum; and New Mexico, 17 per centum: *Provided*, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereinafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

"Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to such requirement, there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof, which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act; (2) costs of the Paonia project, which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay, within a period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181); and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. In the event that the Navajo participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from, and the cost of, constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said Compacts and Acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

"SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of, and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

"SEC. 11. The Final Judgment, Final Decree and stipulations incorporated therein in the consolidated cases of *United States of America v. Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, Civil Nos. 2782, 5016 and 5017, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, are approved, shall become effective immediately, and the proper agencies of the United States shall act in accordance therewith.

"SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed \$760,000,000.

"SEC. 13. In planning the use of, and in using credits from, net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payment of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of said States of the fullest practicable use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to continue studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin on the quality of water of the Colorado River.

"SEC. 16. As used in this Act—

"The terms 'Colorado River Basin', 'Colorado River Compact', 'Colorado River System', 'Lee Ferry', 'States of the Upper Division', 'Upper Basin', and 'domestic use' shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

"The term 'States of the Upper Colorado River Basin' shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

"The term 'Upper Colorado River Basin' shall have the same meaning as the term 'Upper Basin';

"The term 'Upper Colorado River Basin Compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the

United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

"The term 'Rio Grande Compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

"The term 'Treaty with the United Mexican States' shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof."

And the House agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 500, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River Storage Project and participating projects, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language incorporates the recommendations of the conference committee with respect to each of the differences between the Senate and House bills.

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

With respect to the scope of the project, the conference committee agreed to retain in the bill for authorization only the four storage units and eleven participating projects in the House-approved bill.

The matter of retaining intact our national park system was an important issue in the consideration by Congress of this legislation. The House-approved bill—

- (1) deleting the Echo Park storage unit,
- (2) requiring "protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument", and
- (3) expressing the "intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument",—

makes clear the intention of the House that there be no invasion or impairment of the national park system by the works authorized to be constructed under this legislation. The conference committee upheld the House position and adopted the House-approved language.

The Juniper project would have been authorized as a storage unit by the language in the Senate bill. The House language would have required the Secretary to give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit in the event he found the Curecanti unit infeasible. The conference committee adopted substitute language which requires that priority be given to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project but removes the contingency in the House language and does not specify whether the Juniper project is to be a storage unit or a participating project.

The conference committee adopted House language requiring the Secretary to give priority to completion of planning reports on certain participating projects including those, except Woody Creek, which would have been conditionally authorized by the language in the Senate bill.

The sum of \$760 million remains in the bill as the amount authorized to be appropriated. However, the conference committee, in retaining this amount in the bill, agreed that it should not be earmarked projectwise and that there is no prohibition against the use of such funds for the construction of the Curecanti unit, subject to the certification by the Secretary required in section 1 of the act.

REPAYMENT PLAN AND BASIN FUND

With respect to the repayment plan incorporated in the legislation, the conference committee agreed to and adopted language in the Senate bill, which requires the repayment with interest of costs allocated to power in not to exceed 50 years—a requirement that is in accordance with presently established policy.

The House-approved bill contained language setting out certain accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. The conference committee adopted the language of the House bill, which provides for the establishment, from surplus power revenues of the storage project, of credits, within the basin fund, to each State of the upper basin for financial assistance to irrigation development in such State. It should be understood that the revenues thus credited to the States are only for use, within the individual States, in assisting the construction of Federal reclamation projects and shall not be used for any other purpose.

INDIAN LANDS

The House-approved bill contained language making nonreimbursable the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands which are beyond the capability of such lands to repay. The conference committee agreed to and adopted substitute language limiting this provision to the Navajo participating project. This language was adopted in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation and not just the upper basin States.

OPERATION OF POWER FACILITIES

Section 7 of the House-approved bill, containing a grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior relating to operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed by S. 500, has been amended by the conference committee in two respects.

The first sentence of section 7, directing the Secretary to operate such facilities so as to produce the greatest amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm rates, has been amended through adoption of substitute language which relates to the grant of authority to the Secretary, and provides that such operation—

"* * * shall not affect or interfere with the operations of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts."

This language has been adopted to make clear the intent that all of the instruments constituting the law of the Colorado River shall be read together by the Secretary of the Interior in the operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained by this legislation.

In a similar vein, the conference committee has adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House-approved language contained in the second sentence in section 7. The language of this sentence, which deals with the impounding and use of

water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project, has been rewritten to make clear the intent of Congress that, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, such impounding and use shall be subservient to the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes.

APPROVAL OF FINAL COURT DECREE RELATING TO BLUE RIVER WATER

The Senate bill contained language authorizing conveyance to the city of Denver of certain water rights used for the production of power at Green Mountain Dam on the Blue River in Colorado. The conference committee adopted substitute language. These water rights have been the subject of prolonged litigation between the United States, Denver, and water users on both the eastern and western slopes of Colorado in the consolidated cases of the *United States of America v. Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. Since the Senate action on S. 500, agreement has been reached between representatives of the eastern slope and western slope of Colorado and a final decree has been filed by the United States District Court in this matter. Copies of the final decree and stipulations have been submitted to the Congress. The substitute language adopted by the conference committee gives immediate congressional approval to the final judgment, final decree and stipulations, and instructs the proper agencies of the United States to act in accordance therewith.

PLANNING OF FUTURE PROJECTS

With respect to House language in section 13 of the bill relating to the planning of future projects by the Secretary, the conference committee adopted substitute language which does not change the intended purpose of this section. The intention of the language is to require the Secretary, in planning additional developments in the upper basin, to give consideration to achievement, within each of the States, of the fullest practicable use of the water apportioned to each State. Since, under section 5, revenues to assist irrigation development are apportioned to the States on the basis of the estimated percentages of upper basin water remaining to be developed in each such State, the intention of this section could also be stated as requiring the Secretary, in planning future projects, to give consideration to the revenues which it is anticipated will be available for repayment of such projects.

CONSENT TO SUIT OF UNITED STATES

Section 14 of the bill, which gives consent to joinder of the United States as a party to an action or actions by any State of the Colorado River Basin asserting noncompliance with the provisions of law made applicable by this section, has been amended to make clear the intent of Congress that the United States may be joined as a party thereto as a defendant or otherwise.

QUALITY-OF-WATER STUDIES

The House-approved bill included language in section 15 requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make certain quality-of-water studies. The conference committee adopted substitute language which, although not as specific, accomplishes the same purpose and recognizes that such studies are already required by law and are under way.

OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE LANGUAGE

With respect to all other major differences between the House and the Senate bills not discussed hereinbefore, the conference committee concurred in and adopted the House language.

In conclusion, one additional observation appears in order: throughout the hearings

and deliberations of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this legislation, in Floor presentation and debate, and in the several sessions of the conference committee, there has existed unity of understanding and agreement on the purpose of this legislation. That purpose is to authorize the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and to provide for the operation of the facilities thereof in accordance with the law of the Colorado River.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ADMINISTRATION DID NOT INHERIT LARGE DAIRY PRODUCTS SURPLUS

(Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the last 3 years I have read a number of newspaper stories and editorials to the effect that the present administration inherited huge and unwieldy stocks of agricultural surpluses. I do not know if these stories were the product of some reporter's imagination, or if they were inspired and planted for political purposes.

In any event, I suspect that the general public accepts this thesis as a partial explanation for agriculture's difficulties during the last 3 years.

For a time—until I made my own study of Commodity Credit Corporation—I took these news stories more or less at face value. Finally, I decided to make a study of CCC holdings with reference to dairy products surpluses. As a result of this study, I learned some interesting facts about CCC's dairy products holdings.

Before I comment on CCC holdings of dairy products, I wish to make this general observation on the total Commodity Credit Corporation holdings as of December 31, 1952. On this date—which was 20 days before the present administration, took office, CCC had an inventory \$1,053,429,000 worth of agricultural surpluses. In addition to inventory, CCC had pledged for loans another \$1,398,773,000. Thus, CCC on December 31, 1952 had in inventory and pledges for loans a total \$2,452,202,000.

In a speech before the American Dairy Association on March 23, 1953, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson said:

Over a billion dollars worth of farm products were owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation when we took office.

Now, let us look at the CCC report for 3 years later—that is for December 31, 1955. On December 31, 1955, Commodity Credit Corporation had in inventory surpluses valued at \$6,082,180,000. In addition to this, CCC had pledged for loans a total of \$2,584,129,000. This adds up to a total of \$8,666,309,000 in CCC inventory and pledges for loans.

The December 31, 1955, CCC holdings are $3\frac{1}{2}$ times larger than Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory and pledges for loans on December 31, 1952.

As I stated earlier in these remarks, my main reason for making a survey of CCC holdings was to ascertain the facts with respect to dairy products. The facts, I find, show that the administration did not inherit huge and unwieldy surpluses of dairy products.

On January 19, 1953, which was the last day in office of the previous administration, CCC had in inventory a total of \$34,627,000 worth of dairy products. Yes, that is the total of CCC dairy products surpluses was \$34,627,000.

The latest figures that I was able to secure show that CCC had in inventory a total of \$95,610,000 in dairy products on March 7, 1956. In addition to this, CCC also had about \$18 million worth of cheese and butter for processing. Thus, the total value of CCC dairy surpluses on March 7, 1956, was \$113,610,000.

The March 7, 1956, holdings are slightly more than three times as large as the value of dairy surpluses inherited by the present administration on January 19, 1953. Again, I reiterate that the present administration did not inherit huge and unwieldy surpluses of dairy products.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week news reports related to us that the Housing and Home Finance Agency was conducting a letter-writing contest among housewives, offering as a prize an all-expense trip to Washington to attend a conference, the announced purpose of which is to determine what women desire in a home. This is a ridiculous waste of taxpayers' money, for the Federal Government does not build houses; and I suspect that the average builder, who competes in a free market, has a pretty good idea of what women want in a home and, furthermore, I suspect the average builder makes every effort to keep abreast of these desires.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate committees will attempt to find out under what authorization the Housing and Home Finance Agency is planning to spend this money; and, if money Congress authorized for some other purpose is to be used, I would like to know whether there are other instances of misuse of public funds.

We are all concerned with the problem of adequate housing for American families. I am deeply concerned with the problem, and have supported and will continue to support any and all legislation designed for this purpose. Today the problem in homebuilding is economic; there is grave danger that builders may be priced out of the mass-building market. The rising cost of land is an acute problem. Now, if Administrator Cole wants to make a real contribution, he might very well call a conference of builders to determine ways and means of providing the American family with more home for less money.

CYPRUS INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 25, 1956, I attended a banquet in the city of East Chicago, Ind., commemorating the 135th anniversary of free and independent Greece.

It was the unanimous wish of the great gathering that Congress take immediate action to urge the British Government to revise its aggressive policy toward the people of Cyprus and give its citizens freedom to act by plebiscite on the question of its returning as part of the Greek Nation. The arrest and banishing of Archbishop Makarios was denounced as tyrannical and an act that will foment bitterness and impede the cause of peace in Europe and the Middle East. The policy of England in the Greek controversy is unfortunate, provincial and dictatorial.

Our country is spending billions to win the minds of the people of Asian and African countries. The British policy toward Greece is giving the Communist fertile propaganda to use against the western democracies.

Today, I have introduced a resolution urging the Congress to assert itself regarding the injustice being done to the Greek Nation by Great Britain in this crisis. I hope this resolution can be expedited and considered by Congress at an early date.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate while the House is in session tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AIR POLLUTION

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Committee on Small Business has received many complaints from small-business men regarding the harmful economic effects of smog on their businesses and asking if there are any means by which the Federal Government can take more effective action.

In connection with this subject I would like to read the following letter addressed to me by Mr. S. Smith Griswold, air pollution control officer for the Air Pollution Control District, county of Los Angeles:

MARCH 7, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: I am transmitting herewith for your consideration a copy of the district's request to the Federal Government for a financial allocation to be devoted to air-pollution research of national interest. Attached also is a copy of a resolu-

tion adopted by the board of supervisors at their Tuesday meeting.

As you may recall, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had originally requested an appropriation of \$3 million to finance the Federal air-pollution-research program for the next fiscal year. Upon an examination of that program, however, we felt that an increased appropriation should be sought in order to finance several projects necessary to the resolution of our own smog problem, but which were of national rather than of purely local significance. We, therefore, had several discussions with Federal officials and with the Los Angeles County delegation in Congress.

As a result of these discussions a comprehensive conference between representatives of the Federal Government, the State of California, and local public and private air-pollution agencies in California was held at Berkeley last month. Resulting from that conference was a request that the Air Pollution Control District submit details on several research projects which the conference had concluded should properly be performed by the Federal Government. This list of projects, requiring expenditures of more than \$700,000, was prepared and forwarded to Dr. Malcom Merrill on March 1, 1956, for his transmittal to the Federal Government.

Since submitting this letter, however, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL has informed us that the House of Representatives has given passage to the Federal air-pollution appropriation bill and has cut the originally requested amount of \$3 million by \$260,000. Since the original request of \$3 million was considered inadequate, the present allowance, after the House cut, will fall short by about \$1 million of being a sufficient amount to carry on the most important and urgent research projects.

In view of these factors, I felt that you would like to be informed of this situation and that you might wish to take such corrective action as is required in Congress in order to increase the Federal appropriations for the next fiscal year.

I cannot emphasize too strongly our belief that the taxpayers of California and of Los Angeles County should not be expected to bear the full financial responsibility for projects which are more properly of national interest and importance.

As a result of the foregoing information, and as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I conferred with the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who is in full accord and agreement with the members of subcommittee No. 5 that the air pollution or smog hearings in Los Angeles will be very helpful to his committee in determining what remedial Federal legislation will be most effective to combat the serious air pollution programs in Los Angeles and other cities throughout the Nation. Therefore, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Committee on Small Business will hold smog hearings in Los Angeles next May 18 and 19.

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. The first amendment I offered is to elim-

inate the requirement that governments grant to aliens seeking admission under the act, certificates of readmission before they may be considered for a visa. I have offered this amendment because during an extended inspection trip of the Far East last fall, I found that the requirement in the present law in this respect was seriously retarding the successful administration of the act and greatly reducing good will in the Far East which will surely come if the benefits of the Refugee Relief Act are successfully administered. I found that most of the governments in the Far East, many of which have but recently acquired their national independence, are extremely sensitive to all things which appear to infringe upon their national sovereignty. Many of them consider it an infringement upon that sovereignty if they were to issue such certificates of readmission because that would give a foreign government the right to return an immigrant at any time, under any circumstances, and without prior discussion with or consideration by the concerned government. Moreover, this requirement has prevented the United States from admitting some very talented and high type refugees from communism simply because governments of the countries where they now reside feared to enter into an agreement guaranteeing certificates of readmission.

The second amendment I have offered eases the present strange, inflexible, and in many respects impractical requirement for assurances as outlined in section 7 (a) of the act. It is the purpose of this amendment to give full and proper recognition to the facts that American voluntary agencies accredited by the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, are completely dependable and in every sense competent to prevent aliens in whom they have taken an interest from becoming a public charge when admitted to the United States. These American voluntary agencies have established a fine record in assisting our Government in the carrying out of refugee programs in the past. That record shows the best guarantee the Government can have against an immigrant becoming a public charge is to have one of these voluntary agencies take an interest in the alien's case and to lay out a plan for the rapid and complete integration of that alien into the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, there are several pending amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, including a major one introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee. I am hopeful, therefore, that the chairman of the subcommittee will schedule early hearings on all bills seeking to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. I feel that if the great purposes of this legislation, as outlined by President Eisenhower, are to be attained, early and favorable action should be taken on these two bills, H. R. 10206, and H. R. 10207.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SMITH of Virginia, HARRIS, and O'HARA of Minnesota.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a leave of absence for 3 or 4 days because of critical illness in the family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THURSDAY SESSION

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a bit confused about the order of business for the rest of this week. This morning we have on our side anyway—I do not know what is doing over there—a statement from the minority whip that we ought to be here Thursday because the farm bill may come out for a vote. That I doubt. Well, I asked the minority leader. He did not seem to know. Does anybody know about it? Are there any volunteers with information which will guide us through Friday? If there are none, I would like to ask the minority whip what you mean by that notice? Do you want us here Thursday and Friday or do you not? Perhaps later the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will oblige.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. It is a case of a plain possibility. It may be possible. That is all I can say to the gentleman. From the rumors I have heard, it is a possibility, and I say that so that everyone may be alerted.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DIES. It was reported in the press this morning—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which paper? Was it the Washington Post? I do not want to take anything they say as a guide.

Mr. DIES. I think it was the Washington Post; but they quoted certain Senators and others as saying that they were going to have a farm bill before we recessed on Friday. That is what the paper said.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the bill comes out it will be a surprise to most of the Members. I do not believe the paper. Do you?

Mr. DIES. Not all of it.

drivers of our more than 58 million registered vehicles? The engineering talent of our great country each year presents the American public with new style automobiles with more luxury, more horsepower, and, unfortunately, more ability to kill its new owner. Except for power brakes and the automobile safety belt, little has been done to prevent the unsuspecting consumer from killing himself and others as he whizzes along the highways at phenomenal speeds. It reminds me a little of giving a child a loaded revolver and telling him to play safely.

It may be that the automobile as presently designed is totally safe, and it is only man's misuse of this power that makes it dangerous. I do not know. It may be that more rigid enforcement of more stringent traffic laws is what is necessary. Approximately 46 percent of the Nation's traffic accidents are caused by excessive speeding. Approximately 38 percent of all pedestrians involved in accidents were guilty of crossing between intersections. What are the solutions to these problems? I do not know, and I do not believe that the solutions are known at this time. It is for this reason that I feel such an investigation, as provided for in House Resolution 357 can be extremely helpful to the entire Nation.

Publicity campaigns to prevent traffic accidents have been conducted by many fine organizations but these apparently do little to prevent accidents. By Presidential decree, even a nationwide Safe Driving Day was set aside with the much-publicized, hoped for goal of no casualties. When the day's score was tallied, however, it indicated little difference from any other normal day of driving.

Are we going to continue to allow the public to murder itself upon the public highways or are we going to make an effort to determine the cause of these accidents so that we can remove, or at least reduce, some of the hazards? I personally feel very strongly that an investigation, such as proposed in House Resolution 357 can help save lives in the future and it is for this reason that I am here today asking the House to approve this resolution.

The general purpose of House Resolution 357 is to help eliminate traffic accidents and deaths. Specifically, the resolution provides that this investigation first determine the causes, going into such matters as excessive speeding, intoxication, lack of adequate safety inspection of vehicles, insufficiently strict State and local laws, poor condition of highways, and other factors affecting accidents. Secondly, the investigation shall determine what measures may be taken by the Federal Government in eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity. I am aware that several States are making strenuous efforts to reduce traffic accidents within their boundaries. Undoubtedly these States could be helped by information compiled by an investigation on a nationwide basis.

I should also like to point out at this time, as a firm believer in the independence of our States, I do not believe that

any member need fear this resolution will mean Federal interference or control. The sole purpose of this resolution is to help prevent traffic accidents and deaths now being suffered by all the Nation's citizens. It is my personal intention that this legislation can be beneficial in helping States draft new, or revise their present, safety programs by discovering new information determining the causes and means for preventing or reducing accidents.

House Resolution 357 provides that this investigation be conducted by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which does have full authority and jurisdiction to go into the matter of traffic safety. The safety of railroad, airplane, and public motor-carrier passengers are presently under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Committee. I have been advised by the chairman of this committee, that it is expected that the traffic investigation proposed in House Resolution 357 can be conducted out of existing committee funds and that no additional appropriation is anticipated.

I urge the Members of this House to adopt House Resolution 357 in order to help prevent the great waste in human life now being suffered by nearly 2½ million persons each year. We should not wait any longer while the magnitude of this waste continues to grow. I sincerely believe that the adoption of House Resolution 357 today can help have lives for tomorrow.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES FOR POST OFFICE AND DOORKEEPER

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 446 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective April 1, 1956, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the basic rate of \$2,100 each per annum for the employment of four additional mail clerks, office of the postmaster; compensation at the basic rate of \$1,900 each per annum for the employment of six additional doormen, office of the doorkeeper; additional compensation at the basic rate of \$270 per annum for cloakroom attendant No. 3, and additional compensation at the basic rate of \$240 per annum for laborer No. 2 (cloakroom), office of the doorkeeper.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, would our colleague explain this resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This resolution provides for 4 additional men in the post office, 6 additional doorkeepers, and corrects the salaries of certain present clerks.

The resolution comes to the House with the unanimous recommendation of the committee.

Mr. SCHENCK. I merely want to substantiate what our colleague from Maryland says, the resolution comes with the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from California whether or not this is the conference report which was just brought in and ordered printed?

Mr. ENGLE. It is. It is a conference report unanimously agreed to.

Mr. BOW. The membership of the House has had no opportunity to read the conference report or to know what is in the conference report. The committee members are not here today.

Mr. ENGLE. The conference report is in effect the House bill and is a unanimous report signed by the conferees of both House and Senate. The assumption is, of course, that the House will agree to its own bill.

Mr. BOW. Have all of the Members had an opportunity to read the conference report and to know what is in it?

Mr. ENGLE. I would assume that the Members of the House have not had a chance to read it inasmuch as it has not been printed. However, I assure the gentleman that the conference report is in effect the bill the House passed. I asked unanimous consent to bring it up because we want to get it disposed of before the Easter recess. Of course, the gentleman can object.

Mr. BOW. Is there any change at all from the House bill?

Mr. ENGLE. There are some changes, but they are largely technical with reference to language and not with reference to general import.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]?

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9064) appropriating funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1956)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,113,440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In recede from its disagreement to the amendment insert "\$650,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
GORDON CANFIELD,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office Departments, and to the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION FUND

Amendment No. 1: Corrects punctuation as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$2,113,440,000 for "Operations," instead of \$2,108,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,118,880,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$650,000,000 for "Transportation," instead of \$645,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$655,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
GORDON CANFIELD,
BENJ. F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have

until 12 o'clock tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9770.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1958)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
OREN HARRIS,
JOS. P. O'HARA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
J. GLENN BEALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

There were two principal differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill. The House version contained no exemption from the 2-percent sales and use taxes on the gross proceeds from the rental of textiles, the essential part of which includes recurring service of laundering or cleaning thereof (industrial laundry and diaper service companies). The Senate bill contained such an exemption. Under the conference agreement the Senate provision was retained.

The House version of the bill authorized an appropriation for fiscal year 1957, and each fiscal year thereafter, of \$11,000,000 toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. The Senate version raised this amount to \$13,000,000. These amounts are in addition to the \$11,000,000 authorized for such purposes by section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, as amended. Thus, under the House version the total authorized Federal contribution was \$22,000,000, and under the Senate version it was \$24,000,000. The House version also provided that so much of the aggregate annual payments by the United States to the general fund of the District of Columbia as is in excess of \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1957, and subsequent fiscal years, would be available for capital outlay only. The Senate bill raised the \$15,000,000 figure in the House

bill to \$17,000,000. Thus under either the House version or the Senate version there would be \$7,000,000 available under this authorization for capital outlay. The conference agreement provides for an authorization of \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 1957, and subsequent years, or a total of \$23,000,000. Of this \$23,000,000, \$7,000,000 will be available for capital outlays.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL REED,
By T. A. JENKINS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,

Managers on the part of the House.

THE FARM BILL

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I see the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and also chairman of the House conferees on the farm bill, is present. May I ask the gentleman if he can give the House any information as to the status and the probabilities of the conference on the farm bill? Before the gentleman answers that question may I say that in my opinion, the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and chairman of the House conferees, as well as the rest of the conferees, have one of the most important tasks resting upon them that any conference committee, in my opinion, has ever had.

As I said yesterday, the House is in the situation where a bill which passed the other body, organic in its nature, changes the organic law in many important respects relating to our agricultural economy. We cannot take that up under the rules of the House, where debate is thorough and the Members have an opportunity to offer amendments, such as was the case in the other body. Under the rules of both branches, when the conference report comes back it will be more or less a question of voting it up or down.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the conferees could report back to the House for instructions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is so, but it is rather unusual, and I think probably in this case there will be a lot of hesitation about doing that.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, you could proceed in the normal, natural way and report the conference report to the House first, when there would be an opportunity to make amendments. That could be done if it was the desire of the conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not quite get my friend's observation.

Mr. MARTIN. Maybe the gentleman from North Carolina can enlighten me. I understand normally the conference report would come to the House first. I

March 28, 1956

Rep. Sullivan requested that the conferees on the farm bill consider the merit of her bill, H. R. 5105, to provide for a food-stamp plan for the disposal of surplus commodities, as a feature of the conference report. p. 5162

10. WHEAT. Rep. Metcalf criticized this Department for its actions regarding violations of wheat marketing quotas. p. 5163
11. TAXATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8780, to relieve farmers from the Federal excise tax on gasoline used on the farm. p. 5160 This bill is now ready for the President.
12. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9064, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957. pp. 5161, 5140 This bill is now ready for the President.
13. RECLAMATION. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 500, to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project. pp. 5130, 5161 This bill is now ready for the President. The bill provides that no water or irrigation projects constructed by the project shall be used for the cultivation of basic agricultural commodities for a period of ten years following date of enactment. The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$760 million for construction of the project.
14. FARM LOANS. Rep. Hill stated that, contrary to the opinion of Rep. Cocley that no one would introduce the administration's farm bill, he (Rep. Hill) had introduced amendments to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the other recommendations were included in other bills. p. 5166
15. RESEARCH. Rep. Beamer urged that the Agriculture Committee give early consideration to H. R. 10148, to provide for additional research in the industrial uses of agricultural commodities. p. 5166
16. FRUITS. Rep. Tollefson spoke against a proposed reduction in tariff on cherries imported in brine. p. 5166
17. TEXTILES. Rep. Canfield stated that certain importers and Japanese manufacturers of scarves were attempting to weaken the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. p. 5174
18. ELECTRIFICATION. The Government Operations Committee issued a report on certain power activities in the Interior Department (changes in power line regulations) (H. Rept. 1975). p. 5186
19. WATER. Received from the Mass. Legislature memorials requesting legislation extending provisions of the Water Pollution Act; to the Public Works Committee. p. 5186
20. PERSONNEL. Rep. Ashley commended the decision of the Courts regarding the use of secret informers in certain security proceedings, but noted the inapplicability of the case to Federal employment. p. 5163
Rep. Price discussed the shortage of trained scientists and the advances made in the training of scientists by the U.S.S.R. p. 5175
21. INFORMATION. Rep. Lesinski suggested that the "hundreds of thousands" of excess government publications, now out-of-date and stored, be donated to various libraries and institutions. p. 5163

22. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Acting Majority Leader announced the program as follows: Apr. 7, Consent and Private Calendars; Apr. 10 and 11, military installation bill (H. R. 7893); Apr. 12 and 13, Federal Reserve bank purchase of U.S. obligations (H. R. 9285), and watershed bill (H. R. 8750). p. 5167
23. ADJOURNMENT. Agreed to adjourn from Mar. 29 to Apr. 9. p. 5167

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Chipperfield inserted the speech of L. C. Great, Sporn Electric Cooperative, Inc., opposing bills which have been introduced to implement recommendations of the Hoover Commission and stating that "further progress in rural electrification through REA loans...would be drastically curtailed." p. A2713
- Rep. Green inserted an article describing the "impressive" record of repayment to the Federal Government of public funds in multiple-purpose projects in the Pacific Northwest as reported by Bonneville Power Admin. p. A2715
25. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Arends inserted a newspaper article stating that the conferees on the farm bill can either send the President a bill he will have to veto or they can write a bill that will have a good chance of approval at the White House. p. A2715
- Sen. Aiken inserted newspaper editorials, "Hodgepodge Farm Bill," "Rigid-Flexible Bill," "Trifling With Parity," and "Seen Nuth'n Yet," criticizing the farm bill as passed by the Senate. p. A2719
- Rep. Hill inserted the statement which Secretary Benson submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture on the farm bill. p. A2730
- Rep. Seely-Brown inserted a newspaper editorial, "Asking For A Veto," commenting on action taken by the conference committee on the farm bill. p. A2733
- Rep. Schwengel inserted a newspaper editorial stating that "what will emerge from the Senate-House conference on the farm bill is an unknown quantity but it is certain the measure will not be designed so much as a sound relief act as one which can be used to catch votes." p. A2737
- Rep. Schwengel inserted a newspaper editorial, "We Didn't Get Much," and stated that "it sums up the situation pretty well with respect to farm legislation..." p. A2738
- Extension of remarks of Rep. Wickersham stating that "the present administration or any administration owes it to the present populace of our Nation and to posterity to protect the tiller of the soil, the backbone of our national economic life," and inserting statistics "which indicate the facts that the farm population is decreasing and that the size of the farm is greatly increasing..." p. A2757
26. WILDLIFE. Extension of remarks of Rep. O'Hara opposing a proposed bill which would transfer to the Army for an artillery range 10,000 acres of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge in Okla., and inserting a magazine article on this subject. p. A2725
27. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Harrison, Nebr., stated that the "major assault" on the problem of surplus commodities began with the enactment of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, "which has been described as the most significant agricultural legislation in the last 25 years" and inserted the Secretary's report on total export agreements. p. A2726
28. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Engle pointing out that, in his opinion, the relatively small Federal expenditures in our reclamation program

past 3-year period extended from time to time the effective date of the 30-day rule which is now scheduled for July 1, 1956. Except for the trip-leasing feature with respect to private carriers, the Commission has no objection to the bill.

Simply stating the problem before us, farmers and others have empty trucks which must be moved to points where traffic is available. Rather than incur the loss of moving an empty truck, the truck is leased for use to someone who has traffic to be moved in the direction in which the truck is bound. Usually the lease is for only a few days or for the duration of a trip; hence the term "trip lease." Such leases are often necessary to get the truck into position for profitable use, and are often arranged with common and contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the July 1 order, the ICC would have leases of motor vehicles made for a minimum of 30 days, thus effectively putting an end to trip leasing and the economies accompanying it. S. 898 would establish standards for the ICC to follow in regard to trip leasing, with specific provisions designed to meet the needs of agriculture and private carriers.

I have spent a great deal of time on this matter and have conferred with representatives of farm operators from all sections of the country. I am convinced that the bill has been watered down as much as is possible without permitting serious detriment to the marketing of farm products. We all know there are actually thousands of private canneries, meat-packing houses, citrus plants, and the like, which, because of the continual increase in railroad and regulated motor-carrier rates, have been forced from the standpoint of economy of operations to buy their own trucks and transport their own products to their customers. These trucks are an important part of the transportation pool that serves the farmer's total transportation needs.

It would be uneconomic to permit a farmer or a group of farmers who have trucks in which they haul canned vegetables to their customers to lease the trucks to authorized carriers for a back haul, but to deny the same right to the privately owned cannery across the road from the farmer's plant. Likewise, the transportation costs and the right of the private cannery to trip lease have a direct bearing upon the amount which the private cannery can pay the farmer for his products. The same is true with respect to the thousands of private dairy plants, meat-packing houses, and other private concerns that deliver to their customers in their own trucks the processed food and fiber produced on the Nation's farms.

It is important to note that the private carrier, under the bill, cannot go all around the country, as it has been claimed some have done in the past, but will be definitely restricted in leasing his truck in a single movement or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based.

So much for the bill, what it will do, and why it is necessary. So far as agri-

culture is concerned, there is a more far-reaching reason why it is necessary for Congress to settle the matter of trip-leasing by statute rather than to leave it for determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Ever since the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, the ICC has demonstrated its attitude toward the exemption from route and rate regulation of trucks hauling agricultural commodities, which Congress wrote into the Motor Carrier Act in 1935. Obviously the advantage to farmers of exemption from rate regulation of trucks hauling farm products to markets is dependent upon those trucks being able to earn some compensation on the return movement which results in lower round-trip operational costs.

Time and time again the ICC since 1935 has recommended legislative action to Congress which would either restrict or completely repeal the agricultural exemption. In the 69th Annual Report of the ICC to Congress, dated November 1, 1955, and submitted just a few weeks ago, the Commission at page 128 recommended "that section 203 (b) be amended so as to limit the exemption of motor vehicles transporting agricultural commodities, fish, and livestock to transportation from point of production to primary market."

In the same report, at page 129, the Commission recommended that agricultural haulers and private carriers, as well as other carriers subject to safety regulations but not subject to economic regulation, be required to register with the Commission. Of course, we all know that registration is a customary first step toward eventual full economic regulation.

Aside from its legislative recommendations, the Commission time and time again through strict construction of the scope of the term "agricultural commodities" has clearly demonstrated that it wants to exercise more and more regulatory power over the manner and cost of the movement of agricultural commodities by motor vehicle. Today there is pending before the Supreme Court a case to determine whether dressed poultry is an agricultural commodity. The Commission, although admitting that live poultry is an agricultural commodity and that trucks hauling it are beyond its regulatory jurisdiction, has contended that chickens with their heads and feathers removed have been transformed into a manufactured product and trucks hauling such dressed poultry are subject to the Commission's regulatory powers as to rates and routes. In the eighth Federal circuit, where it was held that dressed poultry is an agricultural product, the ICC follows this ruling. In the remainder of the country, the ICC considers dressed chickens a manufactured product—*Kroblin v. U. S.* (348 U. S. 836 (1954)).

Likewise, there is now being litigated in a New Jersey district court the issue of whether shelled nuts are an agricultural commodity. The Commission says no; agriculture thinks that whether shelled or in the shell, nuts are an agricultural commodity.

These are only a few of the many decisions by the Commission reflecting its attitude toward the agricultural commodities exemption, an attitude which has caused farmers to feel extremely insecure about the trip-leasing problem; they will continue to so feel until Congress acts. I must say, in all fairness, that there is much other evidence in the record to support agriculture's concern and feeling of insecurity.

Furthermore, the ICC is an agency of mortal men who may be on the Commission today and gone tomorrow. Any decision by the Commission today on this 30-day leasing rule which will protect the proper interests of agriculture might not be the decision of the Commission tomorrow or at some time in the future when the composition of the Commission has changed. This, of course, does not impute any bad faith at all to either former, present or future members of the Commission. As an example of the changes that occur, since the end of 1955, a little over 2 months, there have developed 4 vacancies on the Commission. Since May 1951, when the original 30-day rule was issued by the Commission, 10 of its 11 members have departed by resignation, retirement, or expiration of their terms.

There are other compelling reasons arising from the manner in which this whole problem has been handled by the Commission that makes, I believe, action by the Congress necessary.

On February 2, 1955, the ICC by official order postponed the effective date of the controversial 30-day rule from March 1, 1955, to March 1, 1956. The deferment was stated as being primarily for the purpose of affording Congress an adequate opportunity to consider and dispose of the pending legislation. On June 22, 1955, when spokesmen for the ICC appeared before our subcommittee at public hearings on this bill, in discussing the effective date of the 30-day rule, the Commission spokesman reiterated that the effective date of the rule had been postponed until March 1, 1956. These assurances were one factor in our willingness for this bill to go over from last year to this second session for action by the Senate. Then out of the clear, after Congress had adjourned last year, on October 17, 1955, the ICC made public an order advancing from March 1, 1956, to December 1, 1955, the effective date of the controversial 30-day rule.

Many Members of the Congress are familiar with this event, and only after many protests from Members of Congress and shippers around the country did the Commission, on November 15, 1955, restore the effective date to March 1, 1956. The Commission subsequently deferred the effective date to July 1, 1956.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, not in any spirit of destructive criticism of the Commission, for whom as individuals and an official body I have the highest respect. I do regard it as essential, however, that the Members of the Senate be acquainted with some of the facts incident to the ICC's handling of this whole matter, which certainly is not conducive to the inspira-

tion of confidence on the part of the agricultural shippers of the Nation that their interests will be reasonably protected in this matter unless a policy is established by statute.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words on this matter of safety. Some of the opponents of the bill have made the argument that trip-leasing must be prohibited to promote safety on our highways. Of course, safety is a matter that is close to the hearts of every American. It involves the welfare of all our families and every person using our highways. We are in accord with every reasonable move that will promote safety. But the fact is that, in the hundreds of pages of printed testimony before congressional committees on this issue, I cannot find any convincing evidence, if any evidence at all, that the leased trucks on our highways are more dangerous than owned trucks. Realistically, it is reasonable to believe that the man who owns and drives a truck under lease to someone else, in which he has an investment, would be just as careful, if not more so than the man who is an employee driver.

A few dramatic cases have been brought up which show accidents in which leased trucks have been involved. But they do not prove anything. One could as reasonably argue that the several railroad accidents in recent months, in which a considerable number of persons have been killed and many more injured, make rail transportation more hazardous than some other modes of transportation. But such argument would be absurd.

There are two rather convincing points that undermine the weight of the safety argument that has been advanced against this bill.

First, the Supreme Court dispelled this argument in its decision on January 12, 1953, involving this issue. The majority opinion said:

The conclusion that highway safety may be impaired rests admittedly on informed speculation rather than statistical certainty. A road check examination conducted by the Bureau (Bureau of Motor Carriers, ICC) did not indicate any significant difference in the number of safety violations between leased and owned vehicles (*American Trucking Associations v. U. S.* (344 U. S. 298, 305, footnote 7 (1953))).

Second, after the controversy over the 30-day rule developed, the ICC reopened the leasing proceeding to take additional testimony on the issue. Further hearings were held before an ICC examiner in 1954 at which many witnesses appeared. The examiner's proposed report was finally released on January 17, 1955, based upon all the evidence he had received, and in his official report on the matter of safety he gave substantially the same answer regarding safety as was given by the Supreme Court.

Thereupon the examiner recommended to the Commission that the effective date of the 30-day rule be postponed until at least March 1, 1957, and that the Commission enter an order requiring authorized carriers to segregate all reportable accidents reported according to whether the accident involves company-owned, term-leased, or trip-leased equipment.

The examiner's recommendation contemplated that in the 2-year period reliable data on a nationwide basis could be compiled and considered at a further hearing as to just what bearing, if any, the trip-leasing of vehicles had on the matter of safety on the highways.

But the Commission did not see fit to follow this recommendation of their examiner, who had heard all the evidence and had an opportunity to weigh it carefully. Instead, the Commission proceeded to order the 30-day rule to go into effect, although it has been subsequently postponed.

So, regardless of the arguments made against this bill in the name of safety, which is of universal concern to us all, it is perfectly clear from the record that such arguments are based on isolated cases and conjecture—not facts that prove anything.

I do not think I need to say more at this time. There was probably never a bill which came before the Senate on which there have been more thorough hearings and screening and on which so much effort has been expended to reconcile the opposing views.

In view of the extended debate recently held on this floor on the farm bill, in an effort to find a constructive way to help the farmer help himself, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress would permit an agency of Government to be free to further extend its regulatory powers, as the ICC has proposed to do and as this bill is intended to prevent, with a certain further increase in transportation costs and a further tightening of the cost-price squeeze on the farmers of our Nation.

This is one of the few issues in my memory on which all of the farm organizations and agriculture generally, from the grassroots to Washington, have been in accord. The National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Farmers Union, as well as scores of other national organizations across the country serving farmers in their marketing operations, have publicly and privately, time and again, urged the passage of this legislation.

I highly recommend that the Senate pass S. 898.

I might say at this point that, as the able chairman of the committee knows, and as the former chairman of the committee is aware, we have discussed this particular proposed legislation, not only with the farm groups, but we have talked it over with the railroad associations, with the trucking groups, and with the representatives of the private carriers.

The bill which is now before the Senate represents the very best bill we shall be able to get on this particular problem. It is my hope that we shall be able to pass a bill which will, once and for all, define exactly what we mean when we give an agricultural exemption and at the same time try to recognize, as we do in the bill, that if we are to have any sort of regulated common carriage in this country, we must continue to give to the ICC certain authority whereby it can control certain certificated common carriers.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator from Florida advise me whether the bill as it has been reported will cover the problem adequately?

Mr. SMATHERS. My answer is "yes." I think the bill will protect the different groups. I am sure it protects the reasonable demands of the agricultural groups.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand an amendment later will be offered. My interest in the bill and the amendment which will be presented results from the fact that in my State of New Jersey there are several large firms which are engaged in the processing of quick-frozen foods, especially the Seabrook Farms—and several firms dealing in canned foods, especially the Campbell soup firm. I understand the bill is to be amended in a way which might affect the activities of the frozen-food industry and the canned-soup industry in my State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I think if the Senator from New Jersey will wait until I offer the amendment, it might be a better time to ask the question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to postpone further questioning of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Mexico so that he may submit a conference report, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of March 27, 1956, pp. 5076-5078, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I wished to present and have printed in the RECORD for the purpose of adding to the legislative history. I do not intend to read the statement at this time. Other members of the committee are present. I am anxious to have them comment on the conference report.

But I ask unanimous consent to have my statement on the conference report printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 500, TO AUTHORIZE THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

In connection with the conference report on S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River Storage Project, a few comments on the consummation of this legislative objective are desirable, not only as a matter of information to the Congress, but to make a matter of record certain points in connection with the legislative history of this measure for the guidance of the executive departments in considering administrative features of the bill. The legislative history will also have an important bearing as a matter of guidance for the Congress in the future in connection with appropriations for the construction of the Colorado River Storage Project.

First, I desire, on behalf of the Senate conferees, to express our appreciation of the cooperative spirit shown by the House conferees in connection with the deliberations of this all-important measure, not only to the development of the upper Colorado River Basin States, but to the arid West and the country as a whole. The adoption of the Conference report will again put the Congress on record in registering unmistakable approval of the reclamation program, initiated under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, through the enactment of the Reclamation Act of 1902. The stamp of approval the Congress registers through adopting the conference report will serve as a rebuke to detractors of the Reclamation program as an instrument for the conservation of the water resources of the West for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, municipal, industrial and domestic water supply. It is the unmistakable answer of the Congress to proposals that the potential water resources of the West—in this case the Colorado River Basin—shall be limited to aid one particular area of the West and that another vital segment of the West shall be condemned to remain undeveloped.

Likewise, its recognition of the fact that again the Reclamation program is recognized by the Congress, the President and the executive departments as deserving and receiving nonpolitical, nonpartisan and nonsectional support.

I refer to the fact that the program for the Colorado River storage project was developed under the democratic administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and it was endorsed and recommended by a Republican, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

On the passage of the bill in the Senate, by a vote of 58 to 23, more than 2 to 1, the party division was:

For the bill: Democrats, 31; Republicans, 27.

Against the bill: Democrats, 15; Republicans, 8.

Not voting: Democrats, 3; Republicans, 12. In the House of Representatives the vote was:

For the bill: Democrats, 63; Republicans, 120.

Against the bill: Democrats, 63; Republicans, 73.

Absent or not voting: Democrats, 32; Republicans, 8.

Passed, 1.

Paired for: Democrats, 11; Republicans, 1.

Paired against: Democrats, 9; Republicans, 3.

This party division is cited for the purpose of showing the nonpartisan front that maintains confidence that the Congress, when the chips are down, drops political considerations and votes for developments of natural resources that benefit the entire country.

Now, as to some of the features of the Colorado River storage bill itself, I point out a

few essential provisions for the legislative record for administrative guidance in connection with the programming, construction, and operation of the Colorado River project.

I shall not reiterate all of the items commented on by the managers on the part of the House in their report. However, I do desire to point out several features of the bill as presented by the conference report which have significance with respect to the legislative history of the measure.

First, Senate bill 500 reaffirms the law of the river, as applied to the Colorado River system by the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1939, and the upper Colorado River compact of 1950. The language with respect to the law of the river is designed to protect the legitimate interest of all States, whether in the lower or the upper basin, in their rights to Colorado River water as laid down in the compacts and in congressional legislation enacted in pursuance thereof.

An objective of the reiteration of the law of the river is also to give maximum protection to lawful contracts made in pursuance of the compacts and the existing legislation. An objective is to minimize the justification for controversy or legal action over contracts or agreements that do not flow directly from congressional authorizations or action.

A second major point that requires elaboration to the intent of the Congress is with respect to section 12 which reads as follows:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act, but not to exceed \$760 million."

It should be pointed out that the amount of \$760 million written into the bill by the House committee and approved on the floor of that body represents merely a current limitation on appropriations authorized and not a limitation on the estimated cost of the features of the project directly authorized in the bill or conditionally authorized through the requirement of the feasibility report by the Secretary before construction may begin, as in the case of the Curecanti Dam in Colorado or projects which may hereafter be authorized by the Congress.

In this connection, the record is made for the information of the Senate and as a part of the legislative history. The conferees considered precedents which have been established by the executive agencies and the Congress with respect to language and figures similar to those in section 12, to which I have referred. Two outstanding examples of precedents may be cited.

One is in connection with the Boulder Canyon project, Nevada-Arizona, in the lower Colorado River Basin. When this project, of which the present Hoover Dam is the principal unit, was authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, an appropriation of \$165 million was authorized. Without any change in the language in the original act, the Congress, on presentation of the situation to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, has appropriated a total of \$223,064,101. Appropriations for Hoover Dam and powerplant alone have totaled \$160 million, or within \$5 million of the appropriations authorized in the original act of 1928. The excess over the original authorization has gone into construction of the All-American and Coachella Canals.

A more recent and at least an applicable precedent is cited in the case of appropriations authorized for construction of the Missouri River Basin project. In this case, the Congress has authorized total appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, of \$550 million, in amounts of approximately \$150 million at a time. Actual appropriations made under these authorizations now total \$494 million.

At the same time, construction of units under the Missouri River Basin project, including multiple-purpose dams, powerplants, and irrigation works have been completed, or started, that entail an ultimate cost of approximately \$845 million. This procedure has been explained to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House by the Bureau of Reclamation with approval of the Department of the Interior. In our opinion, the Missouri Basin project record constitutes an adequate precedent that will insure the ability of the Secretary of the Interior to finance from appropriations to be made by the Congress the initial construction of all of the storage dams and projects authorized or conditionally authorized (such as Curecanti Dam) in S. 500. In simple words, this explanation means that the Secretary of the Interior can and should proceed as rapidly as initial funds are appropriated by the Congress with the construction of the storage dams such as Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and Navaho, those in the initial phase of the central Utah project and Curecanti Dam, when the Secretary of the Interior reports to the Congress that the benefits anticipated from the Curecanti Dam exceed the estimated cost.

At the same time, the program for and initial construction of the authorized participating irrigation projects should proceed. Of course, water must be available; local interest in repayment manifest; and the limitations with respect to bringing new land into production under the surplus crop limitation amendment met.

The Senate conferees accepted the delineation from the bill by the House of the controversial Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument area of western Colorado. The position of the Senate has been that Echo Park Dam would benefit rather than adversely affect the national monument area, and constituted no invasion of the sanctity of national parks. However, out of deference to the sincere views of the great majority of the conservation organizations of the country, and so as to expedite authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project, the Senate conferees yielded on the Echo Park point and made no effort to urge the House conferees to accept the Senate version in this respect. We regard that matter as closed.

Provision is made in the bill for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument by directing that the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, shall take adequate measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge and National Monument.

The conferees, by appropriate language, adhere to the traditional position of the Congress with respect to construction costs of irrigation facilities on Indian lands. Those Indian lands, under participating irrigation projects authorized by the bill, will not be subject to irrigation construction charges as long as they remain in Indian ownership.

With respect to the Navaho participating project in New Mexico the following sentence in section 6 of the bill as submitted by the conferees reads as follows:

"In the event that the Navaho participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navaho Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation, such costs shall be non-reimbursable."

The Senate conferees insisted, and the House conferees receded from the amendment to extend the repayment period for power and other facilities to 100 years. The language of the bill as shown in the conference report provides for a 50-year basic repayment period. It was our feeling that

the 50-year period represents a sounder approach to the maintenance of the principles of the reclamation program.

In conclusion, the conferees express the hope that the construction program for the upper Colorado storage project shall be carried forward expeditiously, efficiently, and economically. Such suggested procedure will require adequate finances first to get planning of major storage units completed so that early contracts may be awarded for actual construction. Construction should be so programed and financed that long-drawn-out periods will be avoided. It is axiomatic that unduly lengthy construction periods result in excessive overhead costs and unexplainable delays in achieving the ultimate objective of the construction of the facilities.

The cooperation of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and both Houses of the Congress in appropriating funds must be mobilized to effect the desired result.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise merely to express my deep appreciation of the great ability with which the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] handled this matter both before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and in the conference between the two Houses. The Senator from New Mexico has won the gratitude of all the upper basin States by the magnificent manner in which he led the fight for the attainment of this great objective, a work which will be of inestimable value to the upper basin States.

I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] upon the floor. He, too, like all the other members of the committee, labored unflaggingly to bring this legislation about. It harnesses the waters of the upper Colorado River, and for the first time stops the wastage of this vital force into the sea. Now, for the first time, in the upper basin States it can be put to use.

I know all of us feel most grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for what he has done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had not anticipated what the Senator from Wyoming would say.

I desire to pay tribute to the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have participated in this rather long and arduous task, and particularly to pay tribute to the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation for their extremely fine work and cooperation. I am looking at the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who on behalf of all of us, introduced this bill or a similar bill 2 years ago, and who has steadfastly, consistently, and persistently assisted those of us who wanted to bring about the result to which the Senator from Wyoming has alluded.

I have been cheered by the fine spirit of cooperation which has been evidenced on both sides of the aisle; and in that connection I mention the work the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has done, and I also mention the work done by his senior colleague from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the excellent work done by the able and very conscientious Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. Let me say that I am particularly happy

that the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is now on the floor. It would have been his privilege, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to have caused us innumerable delays. But he did not do so. He fought vigorously and valiantly for the rights of his State; sometimes I thought he did so almost a little too vigorously. But he was not obstructive. He was willing to see that the Congress worked its way on this particular measure.

Mr. President, I am very anxious that there appear in the RECORD recognition of the fine work done by the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and particularly by the members of its Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his expression of appreciation of the way the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] handled the bill in committee and on the floor of the Senate, and in conference. His work was really outstanding.

It was very heartening to me to work with the group from both sides of the aisle and also with the House group on such a cooperative enterprise, so as really to bring forth a very fine bill which will accomplish the purposes desired to be accomplished by such very important legislation.

I also express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], to my colleague from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and also to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—in short, to all the sponsors of Senate bill 500, which finally has reached this stage of parliamentary procedure. The cooperative effort which was made was very fine, indeed.

Naturally, at this time I think of the beginning of this work. It began many years ago, when the great project known as Hoover Dam was initiated. At that time we began an investigation of the upper Colorado resources and the possibilities of storing its water and putting it to beneficial use. That program has gone forward consistently since that time. When I came into the Congress, during the early stages of my service, I introduced at least two bills to authorize the central Utah project, which is part and parcel of this upper Colorado storage project.

Then in 1952, I believe, I introduced a bill to authorize the Colorado River project. I had been working in reclamation matters for many years before I came to the Senate; such matters have long been of special interest to me.

One of the great experiences in my life has been the outstanding cooperation and the fine spirit of nonpartisanship that have been manifested by all Members of both the House and the Senate who come from the upper basin States. I wish to extend my thanks to all Members of the Senate and to all others who have helped with this great piece of legislation.

I join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in his statement in respect to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. The Senator from California fought vigorously and valiantly to protect the rights of his State.

I am happy to say that, so far as I can determine, the bill—which I think I understand—protects the rights of California and of all the other States. The bill was not intended to take from any State anything which rightfully belonged to it, but was intended only to bring about the development of the waters which had been agreed upon by means of the compact, entered into in 1922, dealing with the waters belonging to the upper basin States, and the putting of them to beneficial use.

Mr. President, this measure is another forward step in accomplishing that great purpose. However, there is no use in our deceiving ourselves; we are still a long way from the time when the first dam will be completed and the water will be stored. It will take a long time to develop this project to its ultimate goal, namely, putting to beneficial use all the waters of the upper Colorado River which have been allotted to the four States under the 1922 compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this long dispute is about to be concluded. Senate bill 500 is about to receive final congressional approval and be sent to the President who will, I have no doubt, sign it into law.

Ever since I first came to the Senate, 4 years ago, I have fought as earnestly and as vigorously as I could against what I contended was proposed legislation inimical to the interests of the people of California whom I have the honor to represent in part.

I am more grateful than I can say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for their comment, because in all the zeal which has motivated me in opposing the measure which now is before us. Mr. President, I have endeavored to be free from rancor and bitterness. I shall never seek the roll of demagogue. On the other hand one who serves in the Senate of the United States is not worth his salt unless as best he can he seeks to uphold the interests and rights and needs of the people he represents.

Mr. President, there are 1 or 2 questions which I should like to ask; and then I shall make a very brief comment, and shall conclude by congratulating my friends who are now finally victorious in this long controversy.

Referring to the conference report, and particularly to section 14, on page 6, I read:

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin.

This is the language to which I desire particularly to refer:

In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

I ask my friend from New Mexico what is the intention, in his opinion, of the language permitting a State to file such a suit against the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the statement was repeatedly made that something in this legislation might permit an administration of the river which would do violence to the rights of California, Arizona, Nevada, or some other State. We tried by this language to make it entirely clear that if a State felt itself wronged by anything that was being done in the administration of the act, it could move immediately into the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States would automatically become a party, and it could proceed with the litigation of the existing trouble. We felt that that would permit a State also to represent its subdivisions, if they were in difficulty over the application of the law.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New Mexico. I remember very well the original discussion in the Senate committee with respect to rights to sue under this legislation, were there to arise a contention of grievance or a breach by a party to a contract with the Federal Government respecting water in the Colorado River. It is one of my pleasant memories that the Senate committee approved the amendment which I offered at that time, providing for the right to sue by States against the Federal Government. While the language, as it comes back from the conference committee, is different from that which was originally approved, I am most happy to see that feature in the bill. I think it is a protection not alone to California, but to the other States of the Union. I am glad to have the views of the Senator from New Mexico, with whom I agree, that a State may, under the conference report, represent its subdivisions, and file a lawsuit if it feels aggrieved.

Mr. President, I would vigorously oppose any legislation which would permit political subdivisions to sue the Government of the United States. In my opinion that would be wrong, and I would oppose it. I am glad that such a provision is not a part of the conference report. But by the same token, I thank my friend from New Mexico and the other members of the conference committee who maintained and wrote into the conference report the right of a State to sue on its own behalf or on behalf of a subdivision, if the State should determine that there was a grievance under any water contract with the United States.

I wish to refer to two sections of the conference report, and to tell the members of the conference committee that I thank them for including them in the bill.

I refer first to certain language at the end of section 4, on page 3 of the conference report, which reads as follows:

All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

I read section 7, on page 5 of the conference report:

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

I thank the conferees for including that language, as well as for including section 9. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of section 9, found on page 6 of the conference report.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, California is a reclamation State. The State from which I come now has a population in excess of 13 million, and we receive into our State a thousand new permanent residents every day in the year. I am sure that they, and we who endeavor to serve them in the Congress, can look forward in the future to the sympathetic consideration of my fellow Senators with respect to their problems relating to water. Water is the basic problem before the people of California.

As I conclude, I congratulate my brethren from the upper Colorado River Basin States, and wish for them god-speed and success in what I trust may be a project which will be of assistance to them and the people they represent and a detriment to none of the rest of us and the people which we represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving as a conferee in this conference, the report from which has just been presented. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and all other members of the conference committee on the fine work that was done in conducting that conference. It was a very difficult task. It was undertaken with finesse, skill, great tact, diplomacy, and all the other arts of statesmanship one should bring to a great task like this.

I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on his feet. I congratulate him. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] was one of the conferees. He did excellent work. Every member of the conference committee is to be congratulated upon doing a statesmanlike, perfect piece of work. This is a great day for the people who live in the Colorado River Basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1739, Senate bill 3386, and that I may be permitted to yield not to exceed 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is a noncontroversial bill. On the 28th of July, 1955, Congress authorized the establishment of a commission, consisting of 15 persons, to make plans for observing the 100th anniversary of the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt. The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 Members of the Senate, 2 Members of the House, and 8 persons appointed by the President at large constituted the Commission.

The members of the Commission were required to file, by the 1st of March 1956, their report on the plans. The report has been filed, and hearings were held. Now it becomes necessary to proceed within about 36 months to carry out the plans.

The pending bill is an authorization bill to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate not to exceed

\$461,000 to carry out the purposes set forth in the bill. There is no objection to the measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in complete support of the measure. I think it very important that we give recognition to Teddy Roosevelt, and that such recognition as is contemplated in the bill be given to him by the Nation. I say most respectfully that I hope the authorities involved will ask themselves the question as to what Theodore Roosevelt, if he were alive, would think about any proposal to prevent a few piers of a bridge across the Potomac to be built on Theodore Roosevelt Island. Knowing his interest in the common people of the country, I cannot bring myself to believe that he would think he was in any way being dishonored if a part of the monument, Theodore Roosevelt Island, served as the foundation piers for a bridge.

On the contrary, I am inclined to believe that he would appreciate the building of such a highway on which human traffic would day by day cross the island dedicated to his memory, with the attention of the people called to the fact that they were crossing Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have never been able to understand the opposition of some of the officials of the Commission to having a bridge touch Theodore Roosevelt Island. We have a very serious situation confronting us. I believe a great memorial bridge could be built to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, just as the Arlington Memorial Bridge, commonly known as the Lincoln Memorial Bridge, is a great monument to Abraham Lincoln. I hope my remarks today, as I support the Senator's proposal, will at least be noted by the members of the Commission. They are completely wrong in taking the position that a Roosevelt Memorial Bridge would in some way not be a proper part of Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon has made his contribution to the support of the bill. I noted with pleasure his statement that a bridge across the southern portion of Theodore Roosevelt Island, which would be comparable to the so-called Lincoln Memorial Bridge, would be an honor to the former President. I shall be very happy someday to appear with him before the Committee on the District of Columbia in an effort to make sure that no bridge which is of less grandeur than the one he has described shall be built in that place. I hope the pending measure may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt", approved

July 28, 1955, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$461,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as is set forth in the report of the committee:

The committee believes it is necessary that the Centennial Commission be provided additional and adequate funds in order to accomplish the purposes set forth in the resolution creating the Commission.

With the prophetic words of Theodore Roosevelt: "The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent," the committee believes that a proper celebration of the centennial of the death of the 26th President of the United States should make this observance a potent factor in the fight for an awakened, free, and inspired America.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND TO THE PUEBLO OF SAN LORENZO, N. MEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 1665, H. R. 6625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6625) to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the pending bill relates to about 1¾ acres of land which the Government acquired from the Pueblo of San Lorenzo for school purposes. For that purpose it paid \$600 for that piece of land. Subsequently, the Government decided not to run a day school at that location, and decided to abandon the school. The Government is now willing to surrender to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo the land which it had acquired from the pueblo.

We felt it would be of no value to have the Government in possession of an empty school building, which would be a hazard to the community. We would therefore prefer to have the land transferred back to the pueblo for its administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to read a brief statement on the bill.

H. R. 6625 proposes to provide for the transfer of title of certain land and the improvements thereon to the pueblo of San Lorenzo in New Mexico without compensation. The property comprises four parcels of land aggregating 1.77 acres which were acquired by the United States through condemnation proceedings in 1920 and 1936 for \$662 for the purpose of establishing a day school for the Indians of the pueblo of San Lorenzo.

According to the committee report, the total estimated value of the improvements on the land involved is \$13,752. The improvements on the property con-

sist of a schoolhouse, a teacherage, a clinic, a small building which houses a home-economics room and four small structures.

Arrangements have been made so that the Indian children of the pueblo attend local public schools, therefore there is no longer a necessity for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to conduct a school or for the United States to continue to hold title to the property.

As I understand, those are the bare, cold facts that are involved in this matter. The Senator from New Mexico, of course, knows the Morse formula problem that disturbs the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. This is a piece of Federal property on which the taxpayers of the country have spent, in round figures, \$13,000 by way of improvements. We are confronted by the physical fact of the property being in the middle of an Indian pueblo, which is really an Indian community. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. On an Indian reservation, I understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I understand further that we are also confronted with the proposition that the Indians claim they have no money.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. What confronts the Senator from Oregon, to be very frank with the Senator from New Mexico, is that he is in the position where, under any other state of facts, he would insist on the application of the Morse formula which requires that 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the land be paid to the Government, because the property technically belongs to all the taxpayers of the country, and not to the Indians.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. However, this exception should be stated. The land was acquired from the Indians for the purposes of establishing a day school. The Indians are very sensitive on the subject of ownership of land within their pueblo. They would never have allowed the condemnation of the land in the first place, except for the fact that the school was to be built on the land. Subsequently it was decided to take the children to school somewhere else. The Indians want this land returned to them.

If the Senator from Oregon were to insist on the 50-percent formula being applied, the Indians would refuse to take the property, and the property would stand as vacant property within the pueblo. I believe such a situation would do violence to the very principle the Senator from Oregon has fought for.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, there would be even some difficulty about salvage operations because the Indians control the pueblo.

Mr. ANDERSON. This is a building that would be worthless as salvage, I may say to the Senator. The Senator knows that I have always helped him in fighting for his principle in the application of what is called the Morse formula. I assure the Senator that, so far as I know, there is no way in which that

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 27, 1956.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 27, 1956.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 27, 1956.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman with respect to the repayment provisions found in the conference report. As I understand, the provisions of the House bill were taken out and the provisions of the other body agreed to. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct, and that represents the only major change in the bill as passed by the House. The Senate provision called for a repayment of both the irrigation and the power features in 50 years. The bill that passed the House required equal annual installments of 50 years on the irrigation features, thus deferring for a somewhat longer time the repayment of the power features. The Bureau of the Budget preferred the language of the Senate bill, and as a consequence of that and in order not to encounter any difficulties with the Bureau on that subject, we took what we regarded as the more restrictive language as far as payout time is concerned of the Senate bill.

Mr. HOSMER. That would be restrictive as to the payback period?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. In other words, the current policy of the Bureau of the Budget is not to look beyond 50 years, and they did not like the provisions of the House bill which permitted the power features to go beyond 50 years for their final payout. So, we restricted it to 50 years on each of them, which made it necessary for us to take out the provisions of the House bill calling for equal annual installments.

Mr. HOSMER. Do the provisions now require that both the power and the irrigation features be paid back within the 50-year period?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. HOSMER. Is there any priority between them in the event the revenues do not provide sufficient money for the repayment?

Mr. ENGLE. The power features have to pay out in 50 years with interest. In other words, what we actually did in the House was this: We had a priority for the irrigation features with 50-year equal installments. We took that out, and what it boils down to is that the power features have to pay out with interest in 50 years, and if there is not enough money to pay for them both the final payment on the irrigation features has to come in later.

Mr. HOSMER. The irrigation features are nonreimbursable, as far as interest goes, to the United States Treasury, and the longer they remain unpaid, the more interest cost is involved.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true in all reclamation projects. So, the repayment program we have in this bill is exactly the same as other projects. The one we had in the House was really more onerous to the landowners because they had to pay interest longer.

Mr. HOSMER. One other question with respect to the \$760 million authorization. I notice that the Curecanti Dam provisions have been somewhat liberalized in that the Secretary can now, if he chooses, build Curecanti or commence to build it, and I am wondering, inasmuch as the cost of Curecanti was not considered in arriving at the authorization figure, if the committee intends that some of the other projects be deleted or that an increase in the authorization will be sought at a later time.

Mr. ENGLE. If they run out of money, they will have to come back to Congress. We left it just exactly as it was in the House bill. The conference report simply joints out that we never set up any priority as among projects; in other words, they can start with whatever is best to start out with, and if they do not have enough money, they will have to come back to Congress for additional authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. As the bill now stands, there is not enough money to go around for all the projects authorized.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, we cannot be too sure about what the situation is going to be 25 years hence.

Mr. HOSMER. Even if the cost remained the same, the possibilities now with regard to Curecanti, which were not considered before, do not make the authorization sufficient on the basis of presently estimated cost for the approved projects involved.

Mr. ENGLE. If they run out of money they have to come back for additional money. They cannot start a project for which they do not have sufficient money to complete and, as a consequence, it is, in effect, saying when they run out of money they are going to have to come back for another authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman means that we have more or less written a blank check?

Mr. ENGLE. No, sir; we have not. They can keep building on what they are authorized to build, and when and if the money runs out a new and further authorization will have to be given by Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the conference report on S. 500, now under consideration, I would like to say there were a number of Members of the House who, like myself, supported this measure when it was considered here 3 or 4 weeks ago. I supported the authorization with the understanding from the committee in charge of the bill, as well as the supporters of the measure, that although this is an authorized project, it will, if appropriations are approved, be what may be known as self-liquidating, and that only approximately 1 percent of the cost of the project will really be charged to the Federal Treasury. When this legislation was considered in the House, the chairman stated that 99 percent of the capital investment will be paid from reclamation funds presently on hand amounting now to about \$27 million, together with income to be obtained from the use of the project, including income from power and income from reclama-

tion. So, because of the small amount of charges against the general taxpayers of the country, I went along with the majority of the House.

The proponents of this bill insisted that major crops grown on the irrigated land will not be the kind that will come in competition with crops grown in other areas, especially those in surplus. As a matter of fact, an amendment was adopted in the House to take care of that situation.

If I thought the authorization of this project would provide for a substantial charge against the taxpayers of this country, I would not support it. We were informed by the proponents of the measure, including the chairman of the committee that approximately 1 percent of the entire cost of the project would finally come out of the Federal Treasury.

I am also advised that the approval of this legislation will to a considerable degree, alleviate a situation in regard to the Navaho Indians who will use a part of the land when irrigated to provide food for themselves so they will not be dependent upon the expenditure of millions of dollars of food costs from the Federal Treasury.

PUT SOME SENSE IN FARM SURPLUS DISPOSAL

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House-Senate conference committee now working on the farm bill could bring some sense and some reason to the surplus food disposal program by adopting, as part of the compromise bill, a food stamp plan such as proposed in my bill, H. R. 5105. This would assure getting some of the surplus to those in our country who are in need—many of them actually hungry. Let us feed our own needy as well as the poor of other nations.

The Senate bill provides for up to \$500 million for sending surplus food abroad, including shipping costs. If we can afford that—and I am sure we can—then we can certainly afford the cost of distributing some of this surplus to needy Americans under a food-stamp plan. We have already bought and paid for this food. Let us distribute it.

The differences between the House and Senate farm bills are so great that the conference committee would have adequate authority to adopt a food-stamp amendment as a compromise provision. I urge the House conferees to suggest such an amendment. I urge its adoption by the conference committee.

We have over 5 million Americans on different forms of public welfare assistance. Each one needs—actually needs—some of this surplus food. These are people who do not now get enough to eat. Let us use this blessed surplus—this abundance—to help feed the hungry here at home as well as abroad.

The Sullivan bill for a food-stamp plan, H. R. 5105, is as follows:

H. R. 5105

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of \$1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2

(1) food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to \$1 billion, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Ad-

justment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivor's insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until noon on Saturday to file a report from its Subcommittee on International Operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight tonight to file a report on certain activities in the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Everette Lee DeGolyer, a citizen of Texas, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Harvey N. Davis, deceased.

Public Law 485 - 84th Congress
Chapter 203 - 2d Session
S. 500

AN ACT

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level, and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskaadee, Silt and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon Unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States, which in the case of the San Juan-Chama project shall include the State of Texas, and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San

Colorado River
storage project.

70 Stat. 105.

70 Stat. 106.

63 Stat. 31.

Initial units.

Curecanti Dam.
Report to
Congress and
President.

Participating
projects.

Rainbow Bridge
National Monu-
ment.

Planning re-
ports.
Priority.

Reports to
States, Presi-
dent and
Congress.

Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

53 Stat. 785.

70 Stat. 106.

70 Stat. 107.

Juniper project. The Secretary, concurrently with the investigations directed by the preceding paragraph, shall also give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project.

Congressional intent.

SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.

63 Stat. 31.

Laws governing.

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): *Provided further*, That for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. All units

43 USC 371
note.
Repayment
contracts.

43 USC 485a.

53 Stat. 1194,
1195.

25 USC 386a.
Restriction.

63 Stat. 1051.
7 USC 1441
note.

52 Stat. 41.
7 USC 1281.

and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

46 Stat. 3000;
45 Stat. 1057.
63 Stat. 31.
59 Stat. 1219.
Basin Fund.

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

70 Stat. 107.
70 Stat. 108.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

Availability
of revenues.

(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unmortgaged balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years.

(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the Upper Division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 per centum; Utah, 21.5 per centum; Wyoming, 15.5 per centum; and New Mexico, 17 per centum: *Provided*, That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereinafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such

Apportionment
of revenues.

projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

70 Stat. 108.

70 Stat. 109.

Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to such requirement, there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof, which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act; (2) costs of the Paonia project, which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay, within a period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181); and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

Interest rate.

(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

Budget to

Congress.

Cost allocations.

(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. In the event that the Navajo participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from, and the cost of, constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

Navajos.

Report to Congress.

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said Compacts and Acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

Power plant operations.

70 Stat. 109.
70 Stat. 110.
45 Stat. 1057.
43 USC 617 note.
54 Stat. 774.
43 USC 618o.

SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of, and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

Recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

Saving provision.
43 USC 617 note.
43 USC 618o.
53 Stat. 785.
59 Stat. 1219.

SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Cincanti, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

Expenditures.

68 Stat. 361.
Effectivity and approval of court decree, etc.

SEC. 11. The Final Judgment, Final Decree and stipulations incorporated therein in the consolidated cases of United States of America v. Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al., Civil Nos. 2782, 5016 and 5017, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, are approved, shall become effective immediately, and the proper agencies of the United States shall act in accordance therewith.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed \$760,000,000.

Appropriation.

SEC. 13. In planning the use of, and in using credits from, net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the pay-out of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States

Net power revenues.

of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of said States of the fullest practicable use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

Sec. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

Sec. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to continue studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin on the quality of water of the Colorado River.

Sec. 16. As used in this Act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin", "Colorado River Compact", "Colorado River System", "Lee Ferry", "States of the Upper Division", "Upper Basin", and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

The term "States of the Upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "Upper Basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande Compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

The term "Treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

Approved April 11, 1956.

Operation and maintenance, compliance.

70 Stat. 110.

70 Stat. 111.

63 Stat. 31.

45 Stat. 1057;

54 Stat. 774.

43 USC 617

note, 618o.

59 Stat. 1219.

Report to Congress.

Definitions.

59 Stat. 1219.

